

**THIRD
ANNUAL REPORT**

JUNE 30, 2004

P.J., ET AL.

v.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Submitted to the:

United States District Court
District of Connecticut

Plaintiffs

Expert Advisory Panel

By:

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Prepared By:

DIVISION OF TEACHING AND LEARNING PROGRAMS AND
SERVICES

BUREAU OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT.....	7
STATEWIDE DATA REVIEW.....	8
DISTRICT DATA REVIEW.....	14
Districts with 20 or more students with an intellectual disability.....	14
Districts with 19 or fewer students an intellectual disability	20
ID Focused Monitoring Districts	22
IDFM 8 Districts.....	22
IDFM 16 Districts.....	27
Summary and Conclusions.....	34
OUT OF DISTRICT PLACEMENTS.....	35
DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION.....	38
CLASS MEMBERSHIP.....	44
EXTRACURRICULAR PARTICIPATION.....	48
MONITORING ACTIVITIES.....	53
TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM.....	61
QUALIFIED SPECIALISTS.....	68
COACHES ACADEMY.....	71
IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM.....	73
COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS.....	75

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION.....	81
EXPERT ADVISORY PANEL.....	88
October 2003 Meeting Recommendations.....	88
January 2004 Meeting Recommendations.....	90
May 2004 Meeting Recommendations.....	92
EAP Report- January 30, 2004 Recommendations.....	96
GENERAL EDUCATION LEADERSHIP.....	110
PROGRAM EVALUATION.....	113
ACTIVITIES: 2004-05.....	115
Monitoring and Assistance.....	115
Training and Technical Assistance.....	118
Expert Advisory Panel.....	118
Parents.....	118
Data.....	119
TABLE INDEX.....	121
DATA INDEX OF APPENDICES.....	123
OTHER INDEX OF APPENDICES BY NUMBER.....	125
OTHER INDEX OF APPENDICES BY TITLE.....	127

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

	Abbreviation	Explanation
1.	ACES	Area Cooperative Educational Services- one of 6 RESCs in the state
2.	AFCAMP	African Caribbean American Families with Children with Disabilities
3.	BSEPS	Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Services
4.	CCIE	Connecticut Coalition for Inclusive Education- one of the Plaintiffs
5.	CGS	Connecticut General Statutes
6.	CPAC	Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center- the Parent Training and Information Center for Connecticut stipulated in IDEA
7.	CSDE	Connecticut State Department of Education
8.	CT	Connecticut
9.	CT ARC	Connecticut's national chapter of the Association for Retarded Citizens
10.	DMR	Department of Mental Retardation
11.	EAP	Expert Advisory Panel
12.	ERG	Education Reference Group
13.	ID	Intellectual Disability; equivalent to MR in Connecticut
14.	IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act- federal special education law of 1997
15.	IDFM	24 districts selected for focused monitoring in the area of intellectual disability
16.	IEC	Intensive Education Centers-term used in Enfield Public Schools for self-contained classes
17.	IEP	Individualized Education Program
18.	LEA	Local Education Agency
19.	LICC	Local Interagency Coordinating Council
20.	LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
21.	MR	Mental Retardation

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

22.	NA	Not Available
23.	PCI	Personal Computer Information- name of data collection system used to collect December 1 special education data in Connecticut
24.	PPT	Planning and Placement Team
25.	PSIS	Public School Information System- name of data collection system use to collect October 2 all student data in Connecticut
26.	Reg. Class	Regular class- defined as greater than 79% time with non-disabled peers
27.	RESC	Regional Education Service Center
28.	RESC Alliance	Collaborative arrangement of the 6 RESCs for joint cooperative projects
29.	SBPP	School Based Practices Profile
30.	SERC	Special Education Resource Center
31.	TWNDP	Time with nondisabled peers
32.	UCE	University Center for Excellence-federal project for training, research and information dissemination located at the University of Connecticut

INTRODUCTION

The **Annual Report, P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL, JUNE 30, 2004**, henceforth referred to as the Annual Report- June 2004, is the third report issued by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) as stipulated in the **P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL Settlement Agreement**, henceforth referred to as the Settlement Agreement. The Annual Report-June 2004, is being issued to the Court, the Expert Advisory Panel and the Plaintiffs for purposes of information and for review. The report includes the following information as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement (Settlement Agreement Section III, p. 5):

1. Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) activities related to the five stated goals and implementation of this Agreement for the prior school year;
2. Reports on all statewide and district-by-district data related to the class members (see Appendix A-G);
3. Reports on the documented progress on each stated goal; and
4. CSDE's proposed activities for the next school year to implement this Agreement.

This report is also intended to inform the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) to assist them in providing annual written comment to the Court, plaintiffs and defendants and in making recommendations relating to progress toward the goals of the Settlement Agreement, development of statewide technical assistance, targeted monitoring, complaint resolution, parent training, and next steps.

The goals of the Settlement Agreement include:

1. An increase in the percent of students with mental retardation or intellectual disability who are placed in regular classes, as measured by the federal definition (eighty (80) percent or more of the school day with non-disabled students).

2. A reduction in the disparate identification of students with mental retardation or intellectual disability by local education agency (school district), by racial group, by ethnic group or by gender group.
3. An increase in the mean and median percent of the school day that students with mental retardation or intellectual disability spend with nondisabled students.
4. An increase in the percent of students with mental retardation or intellectual disability who attend the school they would attend if not disabled (home school).
5. An increase in the percent of students with mental retardation or intellectual disability who participate in school-sponsored extra curricular activities with non-disabled students.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

Over the course of the 2003-04 year, the CSDE has conducted a multiplicity of activities to implement the Agreement. Those activities, including ones stipulated in the Settlement Agreement, are delineated throughout this report. Specifically, the Agreement stipulates activities in the areas of Class Membership (pg. 44); Program Compliance Review (Monitoring Activities, pg 53 and Appendix 1- District Reviews); Technical Assistance (Training and Technical Assistance System, pg. 61 and Appendix 2- A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development: 2003-04); Parent Involvement (Parent Training and Information, pg. 81); the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) (pg. 88); and Complaint Resolution Process (Complaint Resolution, Mediation and Due Process Hearing, pg. 75).

During the past year, in collaboration with the Expert Advisory Panel and the Plaintiffs, the CSDE has identified several additional areas that have assisted in addressing the items listed above. For purposes of this report these areas are each highlighted as individual sections of this report: statewide and district data reviews; out of district placement; disparate identification; extracurricular participation; qualified specialists; coaches academy; immediate response team; general education locus of leadership; program evaluation; and activities 2004-05. Each of these areas contributes to the CSDE's implementation of the Settlement Agreement.

STATEWIDE DATA REVIEW

Following is a data review of the progress that the state has made on achieving the outcomes of the Settlement Agreement.

Connecticut has demonstrated continuous improvement from the baseline year 1998-99 to 2003-04 in Goal #1- Percent of students with ID/MR placed in regular class increasing from 9.1% to 13.4%; and Goal #3- mean time with nondisabled peers increasing from 30.7% to 43.6% and median time with non-disabled peers increasing from 21.5% to 42.5%.

Statewide data from 2002-03 to 2003-04 for Goal #4-percent of students with ID/MR educated in their home school shows an increase from 71.3% to 75.6% and Goal #5-percent of students participating in extracurricular activities an increase from 20.2% to 25.9%.

Table 1-State Goals 1, 3, 4, and 5 from 1998-2003

GOAL		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
1	% of CT K-12 ID/MR students spending 79%-100% of their time with non-disabled peers (Regular Class)	9.1%	9.6%	10.8%	11.1%	11.5%	13.4%
3	Mean % of time CT K-12 ID/MR students spend with non-disabled peers	30.7%	31.6%	34.3%	35.4%	37.5%	43.6%
3	Median % of time CT K-12 ID/MR students spend with non-disabled peers	21.5%	22.4%	30.0%	31.7%	34.8%	42.5%
4	Home School Enrollment for CT K-12 ID/MR students	No data	No data	No data	71.3%	71.3%	75.6%
5	Extracurricular Participation for CT K-12 ID/MR students	No data	No data	No data	20.3%	20.2%	25.9%

Statewide data for Goal #2-Disparate Identification of students with an intellectual disability was examined by incidence, gender and race.

The state has a decrease in incidence rate of students with an intellectual disability from 0.7% to 0.6% from 2001 to 2002, which was maintained at 0.6% in 2003. This is a 16.6% drop in incidence since 1999. During that period of time, the overall incidence rate for all students with disabilities decreased 5.5%

**Table 2- State Goal 2-CT K-12 Students with ID/MR
Incidence* Rate from 1998-2003**

GOAL		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
2	Incidence of CT K-12 ID/MR students	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
2	Count of CT K-12 ID/MR students	4103	3939	3759	3682	3548	3440

*NOTE: Last year this table was referred to as Prevalence. The appropriate term for this set of data is incidence. The term prevalence should be applied when looking at the rate of ID identification only within the population of special education students. Incidence is appropriately cited here as the rate of ID identification within the total student population.

A decline in the incidence of ID/MR in the K-12 population between 1998 and 2003 has been observed. This decrease may be attributed to several factors. First, the incidence rate of all students with disabilities in Connecticut has declined (from 12.8% in 1999 to 12.1% in 2003). Thus, we would expect that the incidence rate for any particular disability category would also decline. Second, in 2000, the CSDE issued revised guidelines for the identification of students with ID/MR. The intent was to clarify the eligibility requirements for being identified as ID/MR and improve the consistency of identification practices. This may have contributed to a change in incidence rate from previous years. Third, for more specific information on the efforts of the CSDE to understand the decrease in the incidence rate, refer to the section on CLASS MEMBERSHIP, page 44.

Finally, changes in the manner by which districts are asked to report their enrollment has improved the reliability of these counts, thus impacting the calculation of incidence rates. These changes are discussed in more detail at the end of this chapter.

In the area of gender for the 2003-04 year, the state is significantly disproportionate in its identification of students with ID by gender, with disproportionate representation of males.

Table 3- State Goal 2-Male Gender Rate from 1998-2003
2003-2004 Data are Preliminary

Goal 2	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Male State (K-12)	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	51.5%	51.5%
Male ID (K-12)	55.0%	55.6%	55.3%	56.5%	56.8%	56.1%

While males are disproportionately represented in ID/MR statewide and within a several districts, a different issue emerges when race and gender are examined together. When disproportionality is examined by race and gender, black females with an intellectual disability are disproportionately represented statewide, yet there is not one district in the state in which black females are statistically significantly disproportionately represented! The issue only bares itself when the data are aggregated to the state level; many districts are contributing to the state data, without any individual district demonstrating statistically significantly different rates of identifying black females.

Disparity of race/ethnicity data has shown a gradual decline in each year from the baseline year in the disproportionate representation of Black and Hispanic students as intellectually disabled.

Table 4- State Goal 2 Race/Ethnicity Rate from 1998-2003
2003-2004 Data are Preliminary

Goal 2	Race/Ethnicity CT K-12 ID/MR (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
American Indian	State	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
	ID	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Asian American	State	2.6%	2.7%	2.8%	3.0%	3.0%	3.2%
	ID	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Goal 2 (cont)	Race/Ethnicity CT K-12 ID/MR (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Black	State	13.5%	13.5%	13.6%	13.8%	13.5%	13.7%
	ID	31.3%	30.4%	29.7%	27.5%	27.7%	26.5%
White	State	71.4%	70.9%	70.3%	69.3%	68.8%	67.8%
	ID	44.6%	45.9%	46.8%	49.7%	48.9%	49.8%
Hispanic	State	12.2%	12.6%	13.0%	13.7%	13.9%	14.5%
	ID	22.1%	21.9%	21.5%	20.8%	21.3%	21.5%

Summary

In sum, the state continues to realize continuous improvement on all 5 goals of the Settlement Agreement. Mean and median TWNDP, percent of students placed in the regular classroom, home school enrollment and extracurricular participation rates have seen continuous increases since 1998. The gap between the identification rates for Black and Hispanic students and the actual proportion of these racial/ethnic groups in the state of Connecticut is decreasing. Identification rates of males as ID/MR increased slightly, but not significantly, since 1998 and continues to be disproportionate to the actual proportion of males in Connecticut. The incidence rate of ID/MR continues to drop in conjunction with an overall decrease in special education population.

Data Limitations

Certain limitations when interpreting changes in the data from year to year must be acknowledged. Methods for calculating statewide incidence rates for students with disabilities has undergone changes during the past 2 years. Before the 2002-03 school year, incidence was calculated using the district wide *enrollment* as the denominator. This data was collected in *aggregate* form, meaning that school districts reported to the State Department of Education the number of students enrolled, by race/ethnicity.

Since the implementation of the Public School Information System (PSIS) in October of 2002-03, the state has collected enrollment data through an *individualized* student data

collection. The resulting effect of collecting data by individual student rather than in aggregate form has increased the accuracy of district accounting of students. Individual-level data collections have the inherent advantage of increased accountability through more detailed data cleaning and error checking, which reduce the frequency of duplicates and reporting errors within the data collection. This has resulted in more accurate district and state enrollment counts.

An additional component to the PSIS data collection is that districts report both where the student is attending as well as which town is *fiscally responsible* for that child's education. This change reflects more useful and accurate information and likely has had a minor impact on the recent data.

As a result, changes in incidence data may arise, not due to actual population shifts, but instead due to more accurate data reporting and the use of more equivalent groups in calculations.

The state remains cautious regarding the validity and reliability of data on goal #4- Home School Enrollment and goal #5- Extracurricular Participation. These data were first collected in 2001-02, making 2003-04 data the third year of the data collection. Each year of collection, data elements are expected to improve in validity and reliability. The CSDE's concern with the reliability of these data was also discussed in the **Annual Report- September 30, 2002** on page 23 and **Second Annual Report** on page 6. Legitimate increases and decreases in data are being countered by improved understanding of the data collection and its definition. The measurement of extracurricular participation rates among students with disabilities has been the target of focused attention via the dissemination of a survey designed to solicit district-level information on the participation rate of both students with and without disabilities. Before beginning to assess or interpret the extra-curricular participation rate among students with ID/MR, it is crucial to gain more information on the availability of extra-curricular activity offerings within any given district, and the rates of participation among both general education students and students with disabilities as whole.

For a discussion of the survey of student participation in school-sponsored extra-curricular activities, please see EXTRACURRICULAR PARTICIPATION, pg.48

Ultimately, any improvements recognized at the aggregate level must be examined in terms of how individual school districts are contributing to changes in the data. The next section offers a discussion of data disaggregated by district with comparisons made among districts serving comparably sized populations of students with ID/MR.

DISTRICT DATA REVIEW

Following is a data review of the progress that groupings of districts have made since the implementation of the Settlement Agreement on the Settlement Agreement goals #1, 3, 4 and 5. The information is presented to offer an understanding of the impact of the state's and districts' efforts on achieving the outcomes of the Settlement Agreement related to education in the least restrictive environment. This section focuses on:

1. districts having twenty or more students with an intellectual disability;
2. districts having less than twenty students with an intellectual disability; and
3. districts targeted for ID focused monitoring in 2003-04.

Districts with 20 or more Students with an Intellectual Disability

Forty-two (42) districts have been identified as having greater than or equal to twenty (20) students with an intellectual disability as determined by examining the December 03 data collection. There are nineteen (19) districts, beyond the 24 districts already identified in the past two years for ID focused monitoring districts that have greater than or equal to twenty (20) students with an intellectual disability. Only one of the originally selected eight (8) districts (Shelton), and none of the selected sixteen (16) districts (16), fell below twenty (20) students with an intellectual disability.

These nineteen (19) districts are: Branford, Cheshire, Colchester, East Windsor, Fairfield, Greenwich, Groton, Middletown, Naugatuck, Newington, New Milford, Plainfield, Southington, South Windsor, Stratford, Torrington, Trumbull, Vernon, and West Hartford. Of the thirty-nine (39) districts identified in 2002-03 as having greater than or equal to twenty (20) students with an intellectual disability, sixteen (16) were not part of the identified twenty-four (24) districts during 2002-03 and 2003-04. Of these sixteen (16), all continue to have greater than or equal to twenty (20) students with an intellectual disability, with an additional three districts added in the 2003-04 year, Branford, Cheshire and East Windsor, totaling nineteen (19).

**Table 5-Data for Districts with 20 or more students with ID*,
Not Including the 24 IDFM Districts**

	Branford	Cheshire	Colchester	East Windsor	Fairfield	Greenwich	CT
00 Reg. Class	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	22.2%	0.0%	42.9%	10.8%
01 Reg. Class	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	8.7%	40.0%	11.1%
02 Reg. Class**	5.6%	11.1%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.3%	11.5%
03 Reg. Class***	4.8%	3.8%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	13.4%
00 TWNDP mean	30.2%	34.9%	36.0%	51.2%	39.6%	61.2%	34.6%
01 TWNDP mean	38.9%	37.0%	40.2%	64.5%	28.9%	55.4%	35.4%
02 TWNDP mean**	33.6%	49.0%	38.0%	56.2%	24.7%	44.8%	37.5%
03 TWNDP mean***	38.4%	41.5%	44.9%	54.3%	39.9%	45.0%	43.6%
00 TWNDP median	17.7%	37.7%	42.2%	54.8%	45.1%	68.7%	30.0%
01 TWNDP median	51.4%	43.1%	42.5%	64.8%	29.8%	56.9%	31.7%
02 TWNDP median**	33.8%	47.7%	43.5%	61.6%	27.7%	44.9%	34.8%
03 TWNDP median***	37.7%	45.7%	42.5%	59.4%	41.8%	45.3%	42.5%
01 Home School	64.7%	94.1%	90.5%	100.0	87.0%	94.3%	71.3%
02 Home School**	77.8%	100.0%	90.0%	93.3	81.0%	76.7%	71.3%
03 Home School***	81.0%	92.3%	90.5%	90.0	87.0%	84.6%	75.6%
01 Extracurr	29.4%	29.4%	23.8%	7.1%	34.8%	57.1%	20.3%
02 Extracurr**	27.8%	33.3%	40.0%	40.0%	38.1%	56.7%	20.2%

* Based on 2003-2004 preliminary count of students with ID/MR

** Since the 2002-2003 data reported in the June 30, 2003 Annual Report were preliminary, some of the 2002-2003 data presented here may differ from that reported in the previous report to reflect corrections made in the final version of 2002-2003 data.

*** 2003-2004 data are preliminary

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Branford	Cheshire	Colchester	East Windsor	Fairfield	Greenwich	CT
03 Extracurr***	42.9%	23.1%	19.0%	50.0%	21.7%	53.8%	25.9%
00 Count	10	16	23	9	20	35	3,759
01 Count	17	17	21	14	23	35	3,682
02 Count	18	18	20	15	21	30	3,544
03 Count	21	26	21	20	23	26	3,377

	Groton	Middletown	Naugatuck	Newington	New Milford	Plainfield	CT
00 Reg. Class	20.7%	9.1%	22.7%	17.4%	4.8%	0.0%	10.8%
01 Reg. Class	7.7%	10.9%	21.7%	26.1%	4.3%	3.2%	11.1%
02 Reg. Class**	90.0%	6.7%	16.3%	28.6%	0.0%	8.8%	11.5%
03 Reg. Class***	8.7%	10.4%	14.6%	36.0%	8.0%	5.4%	13.4%
00 TWNDP mean	45.2%	34.3%	52.9%	40.2%	37.0%	26.8%	34.6%
01 TWNDP mean	37.7%	35.7%	52.7%	46.9%	29.5%	38.8%	35.4%
02 TWNDP mean**	85.0%	37.3%	49.3%	56.5%	34.9%	44.5%	37.5%
03 TWNDP mean***	45.0%	41.9%	45.0%	51.3%	42.5%	48.3%	43.6%
00 TWNDP median	38.2%	34.0%	46.2%	30.8%	38.3%	26.7%	30.0%
01 TWNDP median	37.5%	33.3%	56.9%	44.6%	29.0%	33.8%	31.7%
02 TWNDP median**	98.0%	37.7%	41.5%	63.7%	36.7%	40.0%	34.8%
03 TWNDP median***	49.6%	37.7%	38.5%	55.4%	37.5%	44.3%	42.5%
01 Home School	79.5%	67.4%	91.7%	78.3%	91.3%	83.9%	71.3%
02 Home School**	85.0%	73.3%	81.6%	85.7%	87.0%	97.1%	71.3%
03 Home School***	78.3%	75.0%	82.9%	84.0%	92.0%	91.9%	75.6%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Groton	Middletown	Naugatuck	Newington	New Milford	Plainfield	CT
01 Extracurrr	0.0%	19.6%	16.7%	30.4%	0.0%	12.9%	20.3%
02 Extracurrr**	2.5%	20.0%	16.3%	28.6%	0.0%	14.7%	20.2%
03 Extracurrr***	50.0%	39.6%	22.0%	28.0%	8.0%	16.2%	25.9%
00 Count	29	44	66	23	21	34	3,759
01 Count	39	46	60	23	23	31	3,682
02 Count	40	45	49	28	23	34	3,544
03 Count	46	48	41	25	25	37	3,377

	Southington	South Windsor	Stratford	Torrington	Trumbull	Vernon	West Hartford	CT
00 Reg. Class	3.3%	33.3%	15.7%	8.1%	9.5%	3.7%	13.9%	10.8%
01 Reg. Class	0.0%	26.1%	17.0%	3.2%	23.1%	5.7%	16.7%	11.1%
02 Reg. Class**	0.0%	23.8%	12.5%	2.8%	6.9%	11.1%	17.6%	11.5%
03 Reg. Class***	34.8%	17.4%	12.9%	2.8%	4.2%	10.5%	20.0%	13.4%
00 TWNDP mean	25.7%	61.0%	45.9%	50.6%	42.8%	42.1%	50.3%	34.6%
01 TWNDP mean	29.7%	59.0%	44.8%	41.0%	49.2%	44.0%	53.2%	35.4%
02 TWNDP mean**	35.8%	56.1%	37.5%	41.5%	38.2%	48.7%	46.0%	37.5%
03 TWNDP mean***	50.7%	47.6%	40.5%	44.1%	42.0%	54.3%	51.2%	43.6%
00 TWNDP median	23.2%	64.1%	37.0%	46.7%	36.3%	46.2%	51.6%	30.0%
01 TWNDP median	31.0%	64.7%	36.7%	45.7%	49.5%	53.8%	51.6%	31.7%
02 TWNDP median**	41.2%	68.8%	33.3%	44.6%	40.6%	55.7%	44.7%	34.8%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Southington	South Windsor	Stratford	Torrington	Trumbull	Vernon	West Hartford	CT
03 TWNDP median ***	51.1%	51.6%	36.7%	48.6%	41.4%	56.9%	50.0%	42.5%
01 Home School	65.4%	87.0%	91.5%	90.3%	100.0%	71.4%	66.7%	71.3%
02 Home School**	75.0%	85.7%	96.8%	85.7%	96.6%	91.7%	68.6%	71.3%
03 Home School***	78.3%	78.3%	87.1%	83.3%	83.3%	97.4%	76.7%	75.6%
01 Extracurr	26.9%	17.4%	14.9%	16.1%	100.0%	80.0%	33.3%	20.3%
02 Extracurr**	30.0%	19.0%	22.6%	14.3%	34.5%	94.4%	42.9%	20.2%
03 Extracurr**	30.4%	30.4%	38.7%	61.1%	25.0%	81.6%	50.0%	25.9%
00 Count	30	21	51	37	21	27	36	3,759
01 Count	26	23	47	31	26	35	36	3,682
02 Count	20	21	31	35	29	36	35	3,544
03 Count	23	23	31	36	24	38	30	3,377

The data presented above for the nineteen districts were analyzed in order to determine these districts' progress between December 2002 and December 2003. Districts were examined in terms of whether or not they realized the goal of exceeding the December 2002 state figure by the time of the December 2003 data collection. Districts were also examined with respect to whether or not their 2003 data exceeds the December 2003 state-wide figures. Any district listed as remaining above state figures (2002 and 2003) or moving from below in 2002 to above 2003 state figures to needed to have exceeded an increasing state figure, as all of the state LRE goals (goals #1, 3, 4, and 5) increased from 2002-03 to 2003-04.

For goal #1: **regular class placement** (net loss of 1 district above state figure)

- 5 remained above state figure;
- 1 went from below to above;

- 2 dropped below; and
- 11 remained below

For goal #3: **mean-TWNDP** (net loss of 2 districts above state figure)

- 11 remained above state figure;
- 1 went from below to above;
- 3 dropped below; and
- 4 remained below

For goal #3: **median-TWNDP** (net loss of 4 districts above state figure)

- 12 remained above or equal to the state figure;
- 0 went from below to above;
- 4 dropped below; and
- 3 remained below

For goal #4: **home school enrollment** (net gain of 0 districts above state figure)

- 17 remained above state figure;
- 1 went from below to above;
- 1 dropped below; and
- 0 remained below

For goal # 5, **extracurricular participation** (net gain of 0 districts above state figure)

- 8 remained above state figure;
- 4 went from below to above;
- 4 dropped below; and
- 3 remained below

The data indicates that 5 of the 19 districts are above the state 2003 figures for all five LRE data indicators. These districts are West Hartford, Newington, South Windsor and Southington.

The remaining 14 of the 19 districts fall below state 2003 figures for one or more of the five LRE data indicators of the Settlement Agreement:

- Groton; Vernon; Torrington; and East Windsor (below in 1);
- Colchester; Naugatuck; Plainfield; Cheshire; Branford (below in 2)
- Stratford; New Milford; Fairfield; (below in 3) and
- Middletown and Trumbull (below in 4).

District with 19 or Fewer Students with an Intellectual Disability

One hundred and four (104) districts have been identified as having nineteen (19) or fewer students with an intellectual disability as determined by examining the December 2003 data collection. Thirty-one (31) districts have 10-19 students with an intellectual disability and seventy-three (73) districts have fewer than 10 students with an intellectual disability. There is only one district in this count that was previously selected for ID focused monitoring. During 2002-03 and again in 2003-04, only districts with greater than or equal to 20 students with an intellectual disability were considered for targeting for focused monitoring. In 2002-03 Shelton had 20 or more students with an intellectual disability, but has since dropped below this figure.

When districts have only a small number of students labeled intellectually disabled, changes in the instructional plan or the placement of even one student can have a large impact on the district's aggregate data. For this reason, caution should be used when interpreting data presented on districts with fewer than 20 students with an intellectual disability. It is inappropriate to assess these districts and rank them alongside all other districts.

Disaggregating data by district for districts with less than 20 students with an intellectual disability might also make it possible to link data to individual students creating a potential violation of student confidentiality. For this reason, individual districts are not cited below. Please refer to Appendices H -2003-04 Districts above and below state averages.

For districts with fewer than 20 students with ID/MR, only the 2003-2004 data were analyzed and interpreted.

Of the thirty-one districts with 10-19 students with an intellectual disability:

Regular Class placement:

- 9 are above the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs B, C, D, F

Mean TWNDP:

- 18 are above the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C,D, E, F, H

Median TWNDP

- 17 are above the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C, D, E, F, and H

Home School:

- 21 are above the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C,D, E, F

Extracurricular Participation:

- 19 are above the state figure
- Districts represent ERGs B, C, D, E, F and H

Of the seventy-three (73) districts with less than 10 students with an intellectual disability:

Regular Class placement:

- 26 are above the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C, D, E, G

Mean TWNDP:

- 44 are above the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C,D, E, F, G

Median TWNDP

- 50 are above the state figure; 1 district is equal to the state figure,
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C, D, E, F, and G

Home School:

- 54 are above the state figure,

- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C,D, E, F, G

Extracurricular Participation:

- 31 districts are above the state figure
- Districts represent ERGs A, B, C, D, E, G

ID Focused Monitoring Districts

Following is an overview of the progress of districts identified for focused monitoring during the 2003-04 school year (IDFM Districts). The information is presented to offer an understanding of the impact of the state’s and districts’ efforts on achieving the outcomes of the Settlement Agreement. This section focuses on:

1. the original eight (8) districts identified during 2002-03; and
2. the additional sixteen (16) districts identified during 2003-04.

Detailed data portrayals, CSDE monitoring results, and self-assessments for each of the twenty-four districts targeted during 2003-04 for ID focused monitoring are located in Appendix 1-District Reviews.

Eight (8) Districts

During the 2002-03 school year, eight (8) districts were identified, as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement, for purposes of monitoring: Bridgeport, Enfield, Milford, New Haven, Shelton, Waterbury, West Haven, and Windham. **Table 6- EIGHT (8) IDFM DISTRICTS** provides an overview of all eight (8) of the districts identified in 2002-03. These districts remained in monitoring for the 2003-04 school year.

Table 6- EIGHT (8) IDFM DISTRICTS

	Bridgeport	Enfield	Milford	New Haven	Shelton	Waterbury	West Haven	Windham	CT
Dec. 98 Reg. Class.	4.2%	3.7%	3.1%	7.2%	4.8%	7.7%	13.0%	18.8%	9.1%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Bridgeport	Enfield	Milford	New Haven	Shelton	Waterbury	West Haven	Windham	CT
Dec. 99 Reg. Class.	3.3%	6.8%	0.0%	11.0%	8.0%	7.8%	16.2%	10.0%	9.6%
Dec. 00 Reg. Class.	2.4%	1.7%	0.0%	16.7%	8.0%	5.5%	9.1%	5.3%	10.8%
Dec. 01 Reg. Class.	1.2%	3.6%	5.0%	18.8%	8.3%	2.0%	6.8%	0.0%	11.1%
Dec. 02 Reg. Class.	9.6%	0.0%	5.1%	18.4%	5.3%	4.4%	10.5%	2.9%	11.5%
Mar. 03 Reg. Class.	10.7%	1.7%	5.3%	19.5%	33.3%	4.7%	10.5%	0.0%	NA
Jun. 03 Reg. Class.	13.1%	5.0%	5.7%	17.4%	52.9%	5.9%	15.4%	4.0%	NA
Dec. 03 Reg. Class.	14.1%	11.1%	8.8%	20.5%	50.0%	5.4%	20.4%	12.1%	13.4%
Mar. 04 Reg. Class.	11.2%	11.5%	5.7%	22.3%	50.0%	5.9%	0.0%	12.9%	NA
Dec. 98 TWNDP Mean	25.0%	25.0%	20.3%	22.4%	25.6%	27.4%	25.3%	39.7%	30.7%
Dec. 99 TWNDP Mean	24.7%	31.9%	20.5%	27.1%	28.0%	24.3%	26.3%	33.1%	31.6%
Dec. 00 TWNDP Mean	25.7%	21.3%	17.4%	33.4%	28.5%	19.9%	21.1%	29.6%	34.3%
Dec. 01 TWNDP Mean	24.5%	26.2%	23.4%	36.7%	29.0%	20.0%	18.0%	25.8%	35.4%
Dec. 02 TWNDP Mean	34.0%	32.1%	38.9%	39.0%	28.2%	23.5%	30.3%	30.7%	37.5%
Mar. 03 TWNDP Mean	36.1%	33.6%	39.9%	39.6%	45.1%	24.2%	30.6%	30.9%	NA
Jun. 03 TWNDP Mean	42.3%	38.4%	45.5%	43.3%	62.9%	28.7%	51.8%	42.5%	NA
Dec. 03 TWNDP Mean	45.1%	53.3%	47.2%	45.7%	65.1%	28.6%	38.5%	40.4%	43.6%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Bridgeport	Enfield	Milford	New Haven	Shelton	Waterbury	West Haven	Windham	CT
Mar. 04 TWNDP Mean	43.8%	53.3%	49.0%	45.7%	65.7%	29.4%	36.6%	43.5%	NA
Dec. 98 TWNDP Median	16.1%	20.7%	16.2%	13.3%	12.7%	22.8%	11.6%	30.0%	21.5%
Dec. 99 TWNDP Median	16.1%	29.6%	15.1%	16.7%	27.0%	13.3%	10.1%	27.6%	22.4%
Dec. 00 TWNDP Median	18.8%	15.9%	7.1%	16.7%	27.7%	11.0%	0.0%	23.1%	30.0%
Dec. 01 TWNDP Median	18.8%	27.5%	20.2%	20.0%	31.8%	13.8%	8.7%	23.1%	31.7%
Dec. 02 TWNDP Median	18.8%	31.8%	30.8%	28.6%	19.1%	15.0%	23.4%	26.2%	34.8%
Mar. 03 TWNDP Median	18.8%	33.8%	30.8%	28.6%	51.7%	16.0%	23.4%	30.0%	NA
Jun. 03 TWNDP Median	39.1%	40.6%	43.7%	42.9%	81.3%	24.5%	38.7%	44.8%	NA
Dec. 03 TWNDP Median	40.0%	53.8%	45.2%	45.0%	78.7%	23.1%	29.7%	38.5%	42.5%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Median	40.3%	54.4%	49.5%	45.0%	78.7%	22.4%	29.1%	44.8%	NA
Dec. 01 Home School	44.4%	53.6%	70.0%	58.4%	50.0%	89.8%	36.5%	77.5%	71.3%
Dec. 02 Home School	42.4%	54.7%	56.4%	64.6%	73.7%	52.2%	50.0%	82.9%	71.3%
Mar. 03 Home School	44.7%	56.9%	57.9%	62.5%	77.8%	44.7%	48.7%	73.5%	NA
Jun. 03 Home School	50.0%	58.3%	68.6%	85.8%	82.4%	58.1%	59.6%	84.0%	NA
Dec. 03 Home School	50.0%	79.6%	67.6%	90.7%	83.3%	63.4%	55.6%	72.7%	75.6%
Mar. 04 Home School	70.8%	78.8%	65.7%	87.7%	83.3%	63.6%	53.8%	77.4%	NA

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Bridgeport	Enfield	Milford	New Haven	Shelton	Waterbury	West Haven	Windham	CT
Dec. 01 Extracurr.	12.7%	17.9%	22.5%	19.2%	16.7%	6.8%	8.1%	80.0%	20.3%
Dec. 02 Extracurr.	11.1%	18.9%	15.4%	25.4%	15.8%	4.9%	7.9%	28.6%	20.2%
Mar. 03 Extracurr.	11.2%	19.0%	15.8%	25.3%	16.7%	4.7%	7.9%	29.4%	NA
Jun. 03 Extracurr.	17.6%	21.7%	20.0%	29.0%	23.5%	10.2%	5.8%	36.0%	NA
Dec. 03 Extracurr.	13.6%	31.5%	35.3%	34.7%	33.3%	11.8%	13.0%	15.2%	25.9%
Mar. 04 Extracurr.	21.3%	32.7%	34.3%	35.8%	33.3%	15.5%	13.5%	12.9%	NA
Dec. 98 Count	523	54	32	543	21	222	108	32	4,103
Dec. 99 Count	485	59	41	520	25	204	99	40	3,939
Dec. 00 Count	334	60	40	508	25	201	77	38	3,759
Dec. 01 Count	252	56	40	442	24	205	74	40	3,682
Dec. 02 Count	198	53	39	342	19	203	76	35	3,544
Mar. 03 Count	197	58	38	344	18	190	76	34	NA
Jun. 03 Count	176	60	35	317	17	186	52	25	NA
Dec. 03 Count	184	53	34	259	18	186	54	33	3,377
Mar. 04 Count	178	52	35	332	18	187	52	31	NA

The data presented above for the eight districts were analyzed in order to determine the progress of these districts between December 2002 and March 2004. Districts were examined in terms of whether or not they realized the goal of exceeding the December 2002 state figure by the time of the December 2003 data collection. Districts were also examined with respect

to whether or not their March 2004 data exceeds the December 2003 state-wide figures. Any district listed as remaining above state figures (2002 and 2003) or moving from below 2002 to above 2003 state figures needed to have exceeded an increasing state figure, as all of the state LRE goals (goals #1, 3, 4, and 5) increased from 2002-03 to 2003-04.

For goal #1: **regular class placement** (net gain of 1 district above state figure)

- 1 remained above state figure -New Haven;
- 1 went from below to above -Shelton; and
- 6 remained below (5 of these were still equal to or below the 2002-03 figure- Bridgeport, Enfield, Milford, Waterbury, West Haven, with one exceeding the 2002-03 figure, but still below the 2003-04 figure-Windham)

For goal #3: **mean-TWNDP** (net gain of 3 districts above state figure)

- 2 remained above state figure -Milford and New Haven
- 3 went from below to above -Bridgeport, Enfield, Shelton; and
- 3 remained below (Windham and 2 of these were still below the 2002-03 figure- Waterbury and West Haven)

For goal #3: **median-TWNDP** (net gain of 5 districts above state figure)

- 5 went from below to above state figure-Enfield, Milford, New Haven, Shelton, Windham;
- 3 remained below (Bridgeport and 2 of these were still below the 2002-03 figure- Waterbury and West Haven)

For goal #4: **home school enrollment** (net gain of 2 districts above state figure)

- 2 remained above-Shelton and Windham;
- 2 went from below to above state figure-Enfield and New Haven; and
- 4 remained below (all 4 remained below the 2002-03 figure-Bridgeport, Milford, Waterbury and West Haven)

For goal # 5, **extracurricular participation** (net gain of 2 districts above state figure)

- 1 remained above the state figure -New Haven;
- 3 went from below to above -Enfield, Milford and Shelton;
- 1 dropped below-Windham; and

- 3 remained below (Bridgeport exceeded the 2002-03 figure, but was still below 2003-04 and 2 of these districts were still below the 2002-03 figure-Waterbury and West Haven)

Sixteen (16) Districts

During the 2003-04 school year, sixteen additional districts were identified for purposes of monitoring: Ansonia, Bristol, Danbury, East Hartford, East Haven, Hamden, Hartford, Manchester, Meriden, New Britain, New London, Norwalk, Norwich, Stamford, Wallingford, and Windsor.

The table below provides an overview of the sixteen (16) IDFM districts.

Table 7- SIXTEEN (16) IDFM DISTRICTS

	Ansonia	Bristol	Danbury	East Hartford	East Haven	Hamden	Hartford	Manchester	CT
Dec. 98 Reg. Class.	13.0%	5.3%	6.8%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	4.1%	9.1%
Dec. 99 Reg. Class.	4.5%	10.5%	2.9%	4.7%	12.2%	2.0%	7.3%	2.3%	9.6%
Dec. 00 Reg. Class.	5.0%	7.0%	5.5%	5.4%	10.5%	0.0%	21.6%	8.3%	10.8%
Dec. 01 Reg. Class.	16.0%	5.9%	5.8%	7.6%	4.9%	8.7%	12.6%	7.5%	11.1%
Dec. 02 Reg. Class.	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	3.0%	4.8%	7.5%	6.3%	6.0%	11.5%
Mar. 03 Reg. Class.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Reg. Class.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Reg. Class.	3.8%	13.5%	18.6%	2.6%	11.8%	17.6%	4.6%	9.8%	13.4%
Mar. 04 Reg. Class.	4.0%	28.1%	15.5%	4.0%	7.9%	17.1%	5.4%	10.0%	NA

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Ansonia	Bristol	Danbury	East Hartford	East Haven	Hamden	Hartford	Manchester	CT
Dec. 98 TWNDP Mean	15.2%	32.8%	24.0%	3.3%	27.9%	22.6%	20.2%	38.9%	30.7%
Dec. 99 TWNDP Mean	8.5%	37.1%	29.1%	28.2%	32.4%	20.9%	19.4%	38.1%	31.6%
Dec. 00 TWNDP Mean	19.6%	28.8%	29.2%	33.1%	34.3%	28.9%	39.0%	40.1%	34.3%
Dec. 01 TWNDP Mean	31.8%	25.4%	27.1%	37.9%	32.0%	34.4%	31.6%	38.1%	35.4%
Dec. 02 TWNDP Mean	33.9%	25.3%	29.2%	34.7%	29.3%	33.6%	26.1%	31.5%	37.5%
Mar. 03 TWNDP Mean	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 TWNDP Mean	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 TWNDP Mean	39.9%	55.2%	56.5%	37.2%	39.9%	45.6%	26.5%	38.1%	43.6%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Mean	42.3%	59.7%	51.3%	39.7%	34.7%	46.4%	27.6%	38.2%	NA
Dec. 98 TWNDP Median	0.0%	34.0%	14.3%	0.0%	20.7%	20.4%	13.3%	33.3%	21.5%
Dec. 99 TWNDP Median	0.0%	28.2%	21.2%	13.3%	25.8%	20.4%	13.3%	36.2%	22.4%
Dec. 00 TWNDP Median	0.0%	25.0%	22.5%	25.6%	32.3%	34.5%	23.3%	37.3%	30.0%
Dec. 01 TWNDP Median	27.3%	14.3%	16.9%	35.1%	31.3%	32.4%	21.8%	37.3%	31.7%
Dec. 02 TWNDP Median	36.7%	25.0%	24.0%	33.7%	26.2%	38.4%	21.5%	31.0%	34.8%
Mar. 03 TWNDP Median	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 TWNDP Median	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004

P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
 CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Ansonia	Bristol	Danbury	East Hartford	East Haven	Hamden	Hartford	Manchester	CT
Dec. 03 TWNDP Median	42.8%	55.6%	56.6%	35.9%	45.3%	46.3%	19.7%	36.9%	42.5%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Median	42.4%	64.1%	53.5%	35.3%	45.3%	47.9%	21.5%	36.9%	NA
Dec. 01 Home School	56.0%	67.6%	66.7%	86.4%	51.2%	58.7%	89.9%	71.7%	71.3%
Dec. 02 Home School	65.4%	70.0%	70.4%	86.6%	54.8%	62.3%	70.0%	66.0%	71.3%
Mar. 03 Home School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Home School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Home School	69.2%	73.1%	74.3%	81.8%	58.8%	73.5%	66.8%	66.7%	75.6%
Mar. 04 Home School	72.0%	77.2%	76.2%	80.0%	55.3%	74.3%	68.0%	68.0%	NA
Dec. 01 Extracurr.	12.0%	14.7%	10.1%	7.6%	19.5%	17.4%	8.2%	9.4%	20.3%
Dec. 02 Extracurr.	15.4%	25.0%	9.9%	6.0%	14.3%	24.5%	10.1%	20.0%	20.2%
Mar. 03 Extracurr.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Extracurr.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Extracurr.	11.5%	21.2%	25.7%	9.1%	5.9%	11.8%	10.4%	23.5%	25.9%
Mar. 04 Extracurr.	28.0%	19.3%	23.8%	18.7%	7.9%	20.0%	9.2%	24.0%	NA
Dec. 98 Count	23	38	73	41	38	57	205	49	4,103
Dec. 99 Count	22	38	68	43	41	51	165	44	3,939
Dec. 00 Count	20	43	73	56	38	46	190	48	3,759
Dec. 01 Count	25	34	69	66	41	46	207	53	3,682
Dec. 02 Count	26	40	71	67	42	53	237	50	3,544

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Ansonia	Bristol	Danbury	East Hartford	East Haven	Hamden	Hartford	Manchester	CT
Mar. 03 Count	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Count	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Count	26	52	70	77	34	34	241	51	3,377
Mar. 04 Count	25	57	84	75	38	35	294	50	NA

	Meriden	New Britain	New London	Norwalk	Norwich	Stamford	Wallingford	Windsor	CT
Dec. 98 Reg. Class.	8.7%	3.1%	2.5%	15.0%	2.8%	11.7%	5.1%	3.4%	9.1%
Dec. 99 Reg. Class.	3.7%	2.2%	10.8%	7.1%	0.0%	12.5%	5.6%	0.0%	9.6%
Dec. 00 Reg. Class.	5.2%	5.8%	3.4%	8.2%	3.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%
Dec. 01 Reg. Class.	6.3%	7.1%	0.0%	11.0%	4.4%	5.9%	21.2%	0.0%	11.1%
Dec. 02 Reg. Class.	7.4%	6.8%	2.3%	9.1%	3.2%	5.6%	15.9%	2.5%	11.5%
Mar. 03 Reg. Class.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Reg. Class.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Reg. Class.	5.8%	3.2%	17.1%	15.5%	30.4%	5.6%	5.6%	11.4%	13.4%
Mar. 04 Reg. Class.	10.2%	3.1%	20.5%	12.0%	33.3%	17.1%	5.9%	10.8%	NA
Dec. 98 TWNDP Mean	38.2%	17.5%	34.6%	33.4%	28.6%	20.5%	29.2%	38.0%	30.7%
Dec. 99 TWNDP Mean	34.6%	15.5%	40.6%	30.5%	31.9%	19.3%	22.5%	34.3%	31.6%
Dec. 00 TWNDP	35.2%	19.0%	34.9%	30.6%	32.3%	28.8%	21.8%	39.2%	34.3%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Meriden	New Britain	New London	Norwalk	Norwich	Stamford	Wallingford	Windsor	CT
Mean									
Dec. 01 TWNDP Mean	34.9%	39.3%	32.0%	28.7%	28.4%	32.3%	38.8%	29.2%	35.4%
Dec. 02 TWNDP Mean	35.2%	40.7%	35.3%	27.1%	33.3%	32.1%	35.0%	28.1%	37.5%
Mar. 03 TWNDP Mean	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 TWNDP Mean	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 TWNDP Mean	40.7%	43.0%	49.3%	37.6%	55.9%	30.8%	31.5%	50.1%	43.6%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Mean	45.8%	42.6%	56.4%	33.2%	58.4%	39.7%	33.4%	46.8%	NA
Dec. 98 TWNDP Median	37.3%	8.3%	37.7%	25.0%	35.4%	8.3%	28.1%	44.6%	21.5%
Dec. 99 TWNDP Median	37.3%	8.3%	39.9%	25.0%	38.3%	3.3%	14.8%	41.5%	22.4%
Dec. 00 TWNDP Median	37.3%	8.3%	33.3%	30.0%	36.2%	20.0%	21.1%	43.1%	30.0%
Dec. 01 TWNDP Median	33.3%	40.0%	38.5%	21.7%	25.8%	26.8%	37.5%	28.8%	31.7%
Dec. 02 TWNDP Median	32.2%	41.7%	37.7%	21.7%	37.5%	24.8%	31.3%	26.2%	34.8%
Mar. 03 TWNDP Median	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 TWNDP Median	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 TWNDP Median	38.3%	46.8%	54.3%	34.2%	59.0%	25.2%	35.2%	49.8%	42.5%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Median	46.7%	43.9%	54.3%	33.5%	59.7%	29.7%	41.5%	46.2%	NA
Dec. 01 Home	55.8%	53.8%	84.6%	77.0%	66.2%	75.0%	76.9%	76.3%	71.3%

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Meriden	New Britain	New London	Norwalk	Norwich	Stamford	Wallingford	Windsor	CT
School									
Dec. 02 Home School	58.5%	58.6%	88.4%	83.8%	69.8%	79.2%	63.6%	67.5%	71.3%
Mar. 03 Home School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Home School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Home School	53.5%	57.4%	90.2%	79.8%	94.6%	78.9%	58.3%	77.1%	75.6%
Mar. 04 Home School	56.8%	58.8%	89.7%	72.6%	95.0%	39.7%	26.5%	78.4%	NA
Dec. 01 Extracurr.	93.7%	9.6%	11.5%	5.0%	14.7%	0.0%	15.4%	52.6%	20.3%
Dec. 02 Extracurr.	74.5%	17.3%	18.6%	15.2%	12.7%	0.0%	9.1%	32.5%	20.2%
Mar. 03 Extracurr.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Extracurr.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Extracurr.	66.3%	15.5%	17.1%	7.1%	35.7%	14.1%	38.9%	48.6%	25.9%
Mar. 04 Extracurr.	65.9%	15.0%	35.9%	10.3%	35.0%	15.7%	41.2%	43.2%	NA
Dec. 98 Count	126	128	79	113	72	111	39	29	4,103
Dec. 99 Count	107	134	65	98	66	96	36	25	3,939
Dec. 00 Count	96	138	58	97	66	80	34	37	3,759
Dec. 01 Count	95	156	52	100	68	68	52	38	3,682
Dec. 02 Count	94	162	43	99	63	72	44	40	3,544
Mar. 03 Count	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jun. 03 Count	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Dec. 03 Count	86	155	41	84	56	71	36	35	3,377
Mar. 04 Count	88	160	39	91	60	70	34	37	NA

The data presented above for the sixteen districts were analyzed in order to determine these districts' progress between December 2002 and March 2004. Districts were examined in terms of whether or not they realized the goal of exceeding the December 2002 state figure by the time of the December 2003 data collection. Districts were also examined with respect to whether or not their March 2004 data exceeds the December 2003 state-wide figures. Any district listed as remaining above state figures (2002 and 2003) or moving from below 2002 to above 2003 state figures needed to have exceeded an increasing state figure, as all of the state LRE goals (goals #1, 3, 4, and 5) increased from 2002-03 to 2003-04.

For goal #1: **regular class placement** (net gain of 5 districts above state figure)

- 6 went from below to above state figure;
- 1 dropped below; and
- 9 remained below

For goal #3: **mean-TWNDP** (net gain of 6 districts above state figure)

- 7 went from below to above state figure;
- 1 dropped below; and
- 8 remained below

For goal #3: **median-TWNDP** (net gain of 4 districts above state figure)

- 4 remained above state figure;
- 5 went from below to above;
- 1 dropped below; and
- 6 remained below

For goal #4: **home school enrollment** (net gain of 2 districts above state figure)

- 2 remained above state figure;
- 4 went from below to above;
- 2 dropped below; and
- 8 remained below

For goal # 5, **extracurricular participation** (net gain of 2 districts above state figure)

- 2 remained above state figure;
- 4 went from below to above;

- 2 dropped below; and
- 8 remained below

Summary and Conclusions

The data analyzed above compared December 02 data to either December 03 for the nineteen districts not previously identified as an ID focused monitoring district; or March 04 data for the twenty-four (eight and sixteen) IDFM districts.

Of the twenty-four districts that were selected for ID focused monitoring in 2003-04, there was a net gain in the number of districts that exceeded state figures on goals #1, 3, 4 and 5. Of the nineteen districts that had greater than or equal to 20 students with intellectual disability that were not selected for ID focused monitoring during 2003-04, there was a net loss or no change of districts exceeding state figures in all of the LRE related goals (#1, 3, 4 and 5).

OUT OF DISTRICT PLACEMENT

In an effort to discern the impact of out of district placements on the goals of the Settlement Agreement and identify subsequent interventions, an examination of out of district placements was conducted relative to the type of placement (nonpublic; private special education program; RESC; etc.) and the placing party (parents, district, court, etc.).

One of the initial areas of review was to examine the extent that the RESC system was used by districts as a placement option. According to preliminary 2003-2004 data, 87.0% (2,938) of Connecticut's K-12 students with intellectual disabilities attended school in-district. 439 (13.0%) of these students attended out-of-district programs. According to preliminary 2003-2004 data, as presented in Table 8, 144 (32.8%) of the 439 out-placed students with ID/MR attended a RESC program.

**Table 8: Out of District Placement and Placing Party of Students with ID/MR
(N=439) Preliminary 2003-04 Data**

	District (PPT)	DCF	Juvenile and Superior Courts	Parents, Physicians	Other State Agencies	Total
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Other Public School	54 (16.0%)	26 (32.9%)	0	4 (57.1%)	1 (8.3%)	85 (19.4%)
RESC	129 (38.3%)	8 (10.1%)	0	2 (28.6%)	5 (41.7%)	144 (32.8%)
Parochial/Private	5 (1.5%)	0	0	0	0	5 (1.1%)
Quasi-Public	27 (8.0%)	1 (1.3%)	0	0	0	28 (6.4%)
Private Special Education Facility	81 (24.0%)	24 (30.4%)	2 (50.0%)	0	2 (16.7%)	109 (24.8%)
Out of State	6 (1.8%)	17 (21.5%)	2 (50.0%)	0	0	25 (5.5%)
Other (hospital, shelter, other agency)	35 (10.4%)	3 (3.8%)	0	1 (14.3%)	4 (33.3%)	43 (9.8%)
Total	337 (100.0%)	79 (100.0%)	4 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)	439 (100.0%)

A review of this data indicates that a small percentage of students with an intellectual disability are out-placed, with the largest percentage (32.8%) of those placements being made to a RESC. Additionally, the vast majority of placements out of district are placed by the school districts' Planning and Placement Teams convened on individual students.

The proportion of students with ID/MR placed into a RESC is small (144 out of 3377 or 4.3%) relative to the proportion of students who are out-placed overall (13.0%) and relative to the total number of students with an intellectual disability. An analysis of mean and median TWNDP and regular classroom placement data that compares these outcome measures with and without controlling for out-of-district placements of students with ID/MR indicates that the aggregate measures are being slightly, but not significantly, impacted by the placement of students out-of-district (see data presented below).

**Table 9-All Students (PreK-12) with ID/MR versus
Only In-District Students (PreK-12) with ID/MR:
Mean and Median TWNDP and Percent Placed in Regular Class:**

Preliminary 2003-2004 Data

	Median TWNDP	Mean TWNDP	%>79 TWNDP
All Students	42.5%	43.6%	13.4%
In-District Students, only	45.3%	47.3%	14.3%

The data presented above indicates that, for the large majority of students with ID/MR that remain in-district, placement and services are relatively segregated. Though the CSDE will continue to coordinate efforts to ensure that decisions of out-of-district placements are determined appropriately, the CSDE will maintain a concentration of effort on the in-district student population and programs.

In October of 2003, the CSDE, responding to the request of LEA administrators, addressed the question of how to report home school of students in foster care, not residing in the district of nexus. The CSDE clarified that if a child is placed by DCF in a foster placement within a public school district other than the child's nexus (the district fiscally responsible for the student) and that student is attending the school that he or she would otherwise attend if not disabled in the district in which the child resides in foster care, then the child is considered to be in his or her home school. Currently, the CSDE is auditing the data to determine whether or not districts fiscally responsible for foster-care students appropriately reported these students as attending their home school. Preliminary 2003-2004 data reveals that there are 25 students with ID/MR whose data would be impacted by this clarified data coding scheme. Though the CSDE does not expect that these 25 student records will significantly impact aggregate home school data at the state level, it may be a significant issue at the local district level when districts determine targets for home school. This issue is being addressed by the PCI data manager.

DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION

Efforts to address goal #2 of the Settlement Agreement have focused on addressing disproportionate identification of students with intellectual disabilities in the total population (incidence) as well as disproportionate identification based on race, ethnicity and gender. The issue of incidence is addressed at the aggregate level and is discussed in the **Statewide Data Review**, pg 8. Gender specific issues have been included in the discussion below, and are considered to be addressed via efforts to monitor and remedy disproportionate identification in other demographic categories (e.g. race/ethnicity).

Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity disproportionate representation was assessed by comparing the proportion of students by race/ethnicity within each disability category to the expected race/ethnicity proportion found in the district-wide all student data. As the analysis is inappropriate for use with districts with small numbers of students with ID/MR, only districts with 20 or greater students with ID/MR were eligible for being assessed for disproportionate representation. In 2001-02, five districts demonstrated disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity for students with intellectual disabilities. In 2002-03, seven districts demonstrated this disproportionate representation. Three of these districts can be found on the list of districts for both years analyzed: New Britain, New Haven and Windsor. All three of these districts demonstrated slight reductions in the odds ratios from one year to the next, indicating a reduction in the likelihood of minority student identification as compared to their white (non-Hispanic) peers.

Table 10: Districts (N_≥20) Identified with Significant Disproportionate Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group for Mentally Retarded/Intellectually Disabled Students

2001-02 Academic Year

District	Racial/Ethnic Group	Odds Ratio
New Britain	Hispanic	2.15
New Haven	Black	1.41
Stamford	Black	4.34
Stratford	Black	3.34
Windsor	Black	2.63

2002-03 Academic Year

District	Racial/Ethnic Group	Odds Ratio
East Hartford	Black	2.77
Manchester	Black	3.77
New Britain	Hispanic	1.83
New Haven	Black	1.32
Norwalk	Black	2.92
Windham	Hispanic	2.42
Windsor	Black	2.59

Districts identified in either year were included in all available disproportionate representation activities described below. This is due to the fact that all seven districts identified as demonstrating disproportionate representation for students with intellectual disabilities using the 2002-03 data were also identified using the 2001-02 data, although the disproportionate representation existed in categories other than intellectual disabilities.

Gender

Gender disproportionate representation was assessed by comparing the gender distribution within each disability category to an expected race/ethnicity proportion of 50/50. In both 2002-03 and 2003-04 (preliminary data) six districts demonstrated disproportionate representation of male students within the category of intellectual disabilities. Four of these districts demonstrated disproportionate representation of male students within the category of intellectual disabilities in both years: Bristol, New Haven, Waterbury and West Haven. Three of these districts demonstrated slight reductions in the proportion of male students with intellectual disabilities: Bristol reduced 6.6%, New Haven reduced 3.8% and Waterbury

reduced 1.8%. West Haven increased the proportion of male students with intellectual disabilities by 4.9%, thereby increasing their gender overrepresentation.

Table 11: Districts (N>20) Identified with Significant Disproportionate Representation of Males as Mentally Retarded/ Intellectually Disabled

2002-03 Academic Year

District	Male Count	Female Count	Total	Chi-square	Sig.
Bristol	30	12	42	7.714	0.005
Hartford	138	99	237	6.418	0.011
New Haven	217	126	343	24.143	0.000
Stamford	46	27	73	4.945	0.026
Waterbury	127	76	203	12.813	0.000
West Haven	47	29	76	4.263	0.039

Preliminary Data from the 2003-04 Academic Year

District	Male Count	Female Count	Total	Chi-square	Sig.
Bristol	35	19	54	4.741	0.029
Cheshire	19	8	27	4.481	0.034
New Haven	154	105	259	9.270	0.002
Wallingford	24	12	36	4.000	0.046
Waterbury	113	73	186	8.602	0.003
West Haven	36	18	54	6.000	0.014

It is noteworthy that each of these districts in both years of data was also identified as disproportionately represented in at least one of the major disability categories of intellectual disability, learning disability, emotional disturbance, speech and language, and other health impaired or total incidence. Thus, each of these districts was directed to participate in the activities described below.

Monitoring and Training

For monitoring efforts for the 2003-04 school year, seven districts were identified as demonstrating disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity for students with intellectual disabilities, using the 2002-03 school year data. Additionally, within the disability categories of learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, and other health impaired and overall district incidence, any district with an

overrepresentation was identified. In total, eighteen districts were identified using 2002-03 school year data: Ansonia, Bridgeport, East Hartford, Hamden, Hartford, Manchester, Meriden, Middletown, New Britain, New Haven, New London, Norwalk, Stamford, Waterbury, West Hartford, West Haven, Windham and Windsor.

All eighteen districts, which include those with disproportionate representation of students with an intellectual disability, were required by Commissioner Sternberg to respond to a series of questions on how the district is addressing disproportionate representation within the context of district goals and the general education environment (see Appendix 3- Disparate Identification-January 2003 Commissioner's correspondence to Districts with Disproportionality). Districts from this list may be considered for a site visit as part of the Focused Monitoring in the area of disproportionate representation, which is one aspect of the statewide focused monitoring efforts to be implemented the fall of the 2004-05 school years. An additional 3 districts (Groton, Stratford and Trumbull) while not significantly disproportionate, did have high odds ratios for black students in the category of intellectual disability in their preliminary 2002-03 data that the CSDE believes warrants explanation. Therefore, these additional districts will be receiving letters from Commissioner Sternberg as well. The letters will ask districts to explain how they are addressing the issue of disproportionate identification.

The development of monitoring will consider issues such as: age for grade, retention policies and trends, intervention strategies and efforts to address pre-identification issues that contribute to disproportionate representation. In addition to addressing disproportionate representation through pre-identification approaches, the CSDE is also addressing this issue through special education initial evaluation/ identification and reevaluation/re-identification practices.

The CSDE continued to approach the disproportionate representation issue for students with an intellectual disability via the statewide initiative that addresses disproportionate identification of other disability categories, mentioned above. The Closing the Achievement

Gap initiative, continued with a second statewide Summit in 2003-04, following up from the previous Summit held in the 2002-03 school year. The organization and detail description of the 2003-04 Summit activities may be found in Appendix 2-A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04.

The eighteen districts, listed on the previous page, that showed significant disproportionate representation of minority students in special education were invited to the 2003-04 Summit based on their 2002-03 data (see Appendix 4- Disparate Identification-Summit Invitation, 2003-04) In addition, the remaining sixteen districts that participated in 2002-03 Summit (see **Second Annual Report**, page 58) were also invited (see Appendix 5- Disparate Identification-Summit Invitation, 2003-04 for remaining 2002-03 districts). Twenty-nine (29) of the 34 invited districts participated in the 2003-04 Summit. Districts who did not participate in Summit II are: Bristol, Farmington, Naugatuck, Plainville and Trumbull.

Each of the thirty-four districts identified for Summit I (using 2001-02 data) was offered a planning grant to reduce the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education (see Appendix 6-Disparate Identification-Planning Grant). Eleven districts responded and received \$6,500.00 (Bridgeport, Danbury, Hamden, Manchester, New Britain, New Haven, Norwich, Stamford, Torrington, Vernon, and Waterbury). Three of these districts were identified for the disproportionate representation of students with an intellectual disability (Manchester, New Britain and New Haven). The four remaining districts identified for the disproportionate representation of students with an intellectual disability did not respond to the grant opportunity (East Hartford, Norwalk, Windham and Windsor).

Evaluation/Identification and Reevaluation/Re-identification

In addition to Summit activities to address the pre-identification strategies of the disproportionate representation issue, the CSDE has been in discussion with the EAP during the course of this year regarding the revision of the **Guidelines for the Identification of**

Students with Intellectual Disability. These revisions are intended to more effectively and specifically address appropriate identification practices and reduce the potential for disproportionate identification.

Dr. Coulter of the EAP and CSDE staff met with school district psychologists from districts with disproportionate representation of students with an intellectual disability by race/ethnicity. District participants were from East Hartford, Manchester, New Britain, New Haven, Norwalk and Windsor. This discussion was to gather information about local practice and to discuss the role of assessment in disproportionate identification.

Additionally, over this past year, and most specifically at the May 2004 EAP meeting, the EAP offered multiple areas for consideration in the revision of the Guidelines. The consensus recommendations from the EAP are to be provided to the CSDE by Dr. Coulter for use in the CSDE's revision of the guidelines. The CSDE anticipates receiving these from Dr. Coulter within the next several weeks.

CLASS MEMBERSHIP

Class List

Pursuant with Section I.2 of the Settlement Agreement, a list of public school students in CT who on or after Dec. 1st, 1999 carry the label of ID/MR and who are eligible for special education services was provided in the **Second Annual Report -Appendix G**), from December 1, 1999 through December 1, 2003. For this report, a continuation of this year a list representing the December 1, 2003 reporting cycle was prepared and is included in this report (Appendix G).

As in last years report, the list additionally identifies students that have exited the ID class for that district due to:

- Graduation with a diploma
- Graduation with a Certificate of completion
- Dropping out
- Returning to regular education
- Aging out (Over 21)
- Deceased
- Moved, known to be continuing their education
- Moved, not known to be continuing education

These reasons for exiting are consistent with federal reporting requirements.

Tracking Students

The CSDE recognizes the Plaintiff's desire to track the movement and progress of a single class member cohort. As a result, the CSDE is in the process of initiating a system to retroactively track Class Members beginning December 1, 1998, the first year that individually identifiable student data were available. The dual goals of this system are to: 1) ensure that the CSDE is accurately reporting the number of active students with ID/MR in any given year so that the outcome measures for the goals of the settlement agreement are representative of the population; and 2) document the transition of active students with

ID/MR to inactive status, either due to exiting the system of special education altogether or by being reclassified into other special education categories. The CSDE anticipates that this tracking system will improve its ability to monitor changes in the status of students with ID/MR, to then be able to examine for the legitimacy of this determine re-distribution into other disability categories.

The CSDE has submitted data in the **First and Second Annual Reports** that cited 4,103 active K-12 students with ID/MR in 1998 and an additional 27 pre-k active students with ID/MR in 1998. Using these numbers as baseline, the CSDE is working with districts to account for the special education status of each of these students up to and including the most recent year's data (the 2003-2004 academic year, as of the writing of this report). From year to year, any given student may either; 1) retain their status as an active ID/MR student; 2) change their status as an active ID/MR student, but retain active special education student status under another disability category; or 3) exit the system of special education by either graduating with a diploma or certificate, dropping out, moving, being returned to regular education or dying. Due to errors in data entry in past years, the CSDE does not have complete data over all time points 1999-2002* for all 4,103 students who were active in 1998. However, 3960 of the 4103 students (97%) have been tracked. Currently, the CSDE is working to track 143 students out of that 4,103 who were active Pre-k through 12 students with ID/MR in 1998 and for whom data is incomplete in the years 1999-2003. Below is an outline of the procedures the CSDE is following:

- Cross checked the CompIDs (the student identifier) of each of the active ID/MR students in 1998 with PCISIS, the CSDE's special education student database. For students that return in subsequent years, we are tracking whether their disability category changes or remains ID/MR.

In cases where a student's CompID does not re-appear in subsequent years of data, the CSDE is contacting the district most recently known to be fiscally responsible

* The CSDE will track students through to the data collected in December, 2003. At the present time, data collected on December 1, 2003 is still considered preliminary. Once the data has been finalized, it will be considered in year to year comparisons of student records and incorporated into the tracking system.

for the student. In many instances, responsible districts and the CSDE are discovering that student records are not returning in subsequent years of data because of an error (e.g. typo) in the CompID.

- In cases where the CompID is accurate and the student is still missing from the database, the CSDE is asking districts to verify the status of the student (e.g. whether or not they are an active special education student, what their identified disability is or was, etc...). These verifications are submitted to the CSDE in the form of written statements that are housed by the tracking system data manager. These statements are being used to complete the records as they are being stored in the new tracking system database.

- Once the CSDE is able to successfully document the special education status of each active class member from 1998, the process will be repeated for students newly identified as ID/MR in 1999, then again with students identified in 2000, and so on and so forth.

The procedure described above will enable the CSDE to provide accurate counts of exited and newly identified students in any given year of data, thus providing a context in which to interpret changes in prevalence of students with ID/MR. Furthermore, this process is the first step towards enabling the CSDE to examine trends in the migration of students identified as ID/MR to other disability categories. As the CSDE has already conceded that the special education data collection system is subject to some errors in data entry, it should be noted that CSDE cannot be sure that changes observed in the identification of ID/MR students from one year to the next are not also due to these errors. For example, in past years many students identified as learning disabled (LD) were inadvertently entered into the system as intellectually disabled (ID), and vice-versa. Though the systematic tracking of class members will provide insight into questions regarding re-identification trends, past errors, such as noted above, with the data collection system must be taken into consideration.

Preschool

As indicated in last year's report the CSDE will continue to track preschool children. The class lists mentioned above include these students. Data reporting on the goals of the Settlement Agreement continue to be disaggregated for the preschool population separate from the Kindergarten-grade 12 (K-12) population. All students who are eighteen through twenty-one years of age are included in the K-12 data lists, regardless of grade. All students who are in preschool programs are included in the preschool data lists, regardless of age.

PCI Reported Eligibility

CSDE continues to recognize as class members, only those students whose primary eligibility is reported to the state data system (PCI) as MR/ID. With this said, the CSDE will not and has not denied access to any class mailings to parents that request the information, regardless of whether their child is or is not a member of the class.

EXTRACURRICULAR PARTICIPATION

Since data on the participation rate of students with disabilities in school-sponsored extra-curricular activities first became available to the CSDE in 2001, each successive year of data has shown an increase in participation rates among students with intellectual disabilities. Yearly increases in this outcome measure demonstrate that the CSDE is achieving some success in meeting the requirements of goal #5 of the Settlement Agreement.

The CSDE has data on all students with disabilities, both at the state and national levels, which can be used to evaluate the participation rate of students with intellectual disabilities against that of their disabled peers. Preliminary 2003 data indicates that 26.8% of all Connecticut K-12 students with disabilities participated in extra-curricular activities in the 2003-2004 school year. The participation rate among Connecticut K-12 students with ID/MR is roughly the same (26.0%). This suggests that students with ID/MR are participating in school-sponsored extra-curricular activities at the same rate as students with other disabilities.

A national study, *Social Activities of Youth with Disabilities*, (Wagner, Cadwaller, Garza and Cameto, 2004, National Center on Secondary Education and Training) (Appendix 7- Extracurricular Article) of extra-curricular participation among youth with disabilities found that, in 2000, 33% of students ages 13-16 with ID/MR participated in organized group activities at school. Although CSDE's data collection does not permit a comparison of data collected at the same point in time, an analysis of Connecticut's 13- 16 year-old ID/MR population from 2001 through 2003 indicates that Connecticut's participation rate for this age cohort is somewhat similar to the national trend.

**Table 12- Extra-curricular participation among
Connecticut’s 13-16 year-old students with ID/MR**

Year	2001	2002	2003
Percent Participation CT K-12 ID/MR Students, Ages 13-16	24.7%	25.2%	32.0%

As reflected in other CSDE documents that present data on goal #5, including the **Second Annual Report** to the Court, data gathered on the participation of students with disabilities in school sponsored extra-curricular activities is subject to variations of validity and reliability which typically accompany the initial iterations of any new data collection. Here, the greatest challenge to the validity and reliability of the data is the lack of consistency in the understanding of which activities qualify as school-sponsored extra-curricular activities and which do not. Moreover, as the CSDE has worked to design tailored interventions to assist LEAs in improving outcomes on this goal, district to district comparisons are not appropriate, as the rate of participation in extra-curricular activities is directly dependent on the number and variety of activities offered to all students within any particular school district. It is not presently possible to assess the relative engagement of students with intellectual disabilities in school-sponsored extracurricular activities compared to non-disabled students since the CSDE currently has no measure of the rate of participation among non-disabled students.

In order to better understand the data, the CSDE contracted with Words & Numbers Research, Inc.® to conduct a survey of school building leaders (e.g., principals). Data from this survey is presented in this **Third Annual Report**, though the data reported by Words & Numbers Research, Inc.® is still preliminary and will continue to be considered preliminary until the report by Words & Numbers Research, Inc.® is published later this summer. This survey provides additional information to that gathered in a 2002 survey of parents and

directors of special education. That survey provided information on the different types of extracurricular activities offered by schools and the reasons typically preventing participation from students with disabilities (see **Annual Report-September 30, 2002-Appendix 12**).

In the current survey, a sample of 1,100 building leaders throughout the state of Connecticut, representing elementary, middle and secondary schools, received a ten item questionnaire designed to gather estimates of extra-curricular participation rates among both disabled and non-disabled students. A definition of school-sponsored extra-curricular activities accompanied each survey in order to increase inter-respondent reliability. Respondents were asked to provide information on:

- Total school enrollment
- Special education enrollment
- Type of school (Elementary, Middle, Secondary)
- ERG membership
- Number of extracurricular activities from previous school year (increase/decrease)
- Number of extracurricular activities for coming school year (increase/decrease)
- Estimates of participation for general education students
- Estimates of participation for special education students
- Estimates for both groups of students by six types of extracurricular activities:
 1. *Sports*
 2. *Clubs*
 3. *Leadership*
 4. *Arts*
 5. *Writing*
 6. *All others*

Twenty-five percent (273) of the original 1,100 building leaders sampled returned completed surveys. The majority of those who responded represented elementary schools, with secondary schools the next highly represented, followed by middle schools and private

schools (K-12). All ERGs in the state were represented by the respondents, with the lowest proportion of responses (4%) representing ERG G, and the highest proportion coming from ERGs F and I (each represented by 14% of the responses).

It should also be noted that the only schools considered in the analysis of the data are those that in fact, sponsored extra-curricular activities. For example, 18% of elementary school leaders who responded to the survey reported that their school did not offer any school-sponsored extra-curricular activities to their student population. These 18% of elementary schools were not factored into the analyses.

Preliminary findings indicate that, on average, school leaders estimate that 32% of their special education students participate in extra-curricular activities, while the estimate for general education students is 43%. This trend of perceived higher rates of participation among regular education students holds across school settings, although the greatest gap in the participation estimate for general education students versus special education students occurred at the secondary school level, and for competitively-based activities, such as sports.

When asked to estimate the raw numbers of students participating in each of the different school sponsored activities, the most dramatic differences in the rates of participation between general education students and special education students occurred in the category of sports (a 5% difference in favor of general education students), with the arts ranking second (a 2% difference in favor of general education students). When broken out by school level, elementary school leaders did not report significant differences in the participation of regular and special education students across the different categories of activities. It is at the middle and secondary school levels that differences in participation based on type of activity become more pronounced, with the proportion of students in regular education participating in sports activities far exceeding the proportion of students with disabilities (at the secondary school level, the difference was a 17% in favor of regular education students).

The implications of these preliminary findings suggest that school leaders perceive a gap between general and special education students with respect to their participation in school-sponsored activities. Furthermore, this gap is perceived to widen at higher grade-levels, especially in the participation of competitive based activities.

It should be emphasized that data gathered from this survey is based on the *perception* that building leaders hold regarding student involvement in extra-curricular activities. This is a limitation to the interpretation of the findings. However, the survey provides the CSDE with a sense of the context in which to interpret extra-curricular participation rates among students with disabilities overall, and students with intellectual disabilities in particular, although the survey did not estimate participation rates by disability category.

The CSDE recognizes that the participation rate of students with an intellectual disability in a particular district cannot be appropriately interpreted without knowledge of extra-curricular activity offerings in that district. Furthermore, as the findings from this survey indicate, the participation of students with intellectual disabilities in extra-curricular activities must be evaluated against the rate of participation among all students. The survey described above was the first step towards measuring statewide trends in the participation of Connecticut students in extra-curricular activities. Future activities in this area will be informed by future data collections on students with disabilities and additional findings from this preliminary survey. The CSDE is also working with districts to build capacity to collect their own data on extra-curricular participation rates among their students and to use that data to set district-specific goals around this issue.

MONITORING ACTIVITIES

Monitoring activities have been conducted in several areas this past year related to the Settlement Agreement. These activities included follow up to the 2002-03 Program, Review-ID Specific, Focused Monitoring for Disparate Identification, Focused Monitoring-ID Specific on LRE, and Monitoring of Hearing Decisions.

Follow up to 2002-03 Program Review-ID Specific

Follow up occurred with those districts that were reviewed through the state's Program Review process during the 2002-03 school year. The Program Review process was described in the **Second Annual Report**.

Of the fifteen (15) districts selected for site visits last year, four (4) (Derby, East Haven, North Branford, and Seymour) received more specific analysis of ID programming during the current year's site visit (see **Program Review-ID Specific** section of the **Second Annual Report**, p. 57). Additionally, five (5) other districts (Milford, Shelton, New Haven, Waterbury, and West Haven) of the fifteen (15) were identified to receive additional ID focused monitoring through the Settlement Agreement (see **ID Focused Monitoring** section of **Second Annual Report**, p. 60).

Below is the current status of these districts' 2002-03 Program Review with their required interventions, specific to issues in the Settlement Agreement.

**Table 13: Program Review 2002-03: Current Status of District Issues
Related to the Settlement Agreement**

Issue	Districts with Required Action to be Taken	Current Status	The following districts were identified for monitoring under the PJ Settlement Agreement although they are closed out on all other program review issues- Hamden, Meriden and Shelton
Justification for Removal – use of LRE checklist	Milford, New Haven, West Haven, East Haven, Ansonia, North Branford, Seymour, Woodbridge, Reg. 16, Hamden, Meriden	Satisfactory: Woodbridge, North Branford, Reg. #16	
LRE ID General	Hamden, Milford, New Haven, Waterbury, West Haven, Ansonia, East Haven, Meriden		
LRE preschool	New Haven, Waterbury, Ansonia		
LRE TWNDP	Ansonia,	Satisfactory: Seymour	
LRE TWNDP – ID	Milford, New Haven, Waterbury, West Haven, Ansonia, East Haven	Satisfactory: Reg. #16	
LRE Regular Class – ID	New Haven, Waterbury		
LRE Extracurricular	None	Not Applicable	
LRE Extracurricular – ID	Milford, New Haven, Waterbury, West Haven, Ansonia,	Satisfactory: North Branford	
LRE ID Home School	Milford, New Haven, Waterbury, West Haven		
LRE Home School	None	None	
Identification	Waterbury, West Haven, Ansonia,	Satisfactory: North Branford	
Identification ID	New Haven, Waterbury, West Haven, Ansonia, East Haven,	Satisfactory: North Branford	
Out Of District Placements	West Haven, Ansonia, East Haven	Satisfactory: North Branford	

Monitoring-Disparate Representation

There were seven (7) districts that were identified with disproportionate identification in the area of race/ethnicity for members of the class. They are East Hartford, Manchester, New Britain, New Haven, Norwalk, Windsor and Windham. These districts, along with eleven (11) others that had disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity within other disability categories or overall prevalence (see Appendix B-1998-2003 goal #2), were sent letters in January 2004 from the Commissioner identifying this as an area of concern requiring district action (see Appendix 3 Disparate Identification-January 2004 Commissioner's Correspondence to Districts with Disproportionality). These eighteen (18) districts, in addition to the other eleven (11), were required to explain the district data and identify what actions were occurring to address the issues. Districts needed to respond to the following questions:

1. Verify that the data presented are accurate. If not, provide a thorough explanation of why, and the correct data, and explain how the district will work with the Department to ensure accurate data in the future.
2. Give specific examples of how the issue of overrepresentation of minority students in special education is being addressed through your district goals and within general education. Consider the following items in your response:
 - a. What specific actions are being taken to reduce the overrepresentation of minority students in special education. Actions such as examining and revising your special education eligibility procedures and practices, professional development, curriculum and instruction, early screening and intervention, and academic and behavioral interventions should be considered.
 - b. How are data on disparate identification rates across different race/ethnicity categories being used in the district? Give examples of discussions with teachers, administrators, board of education members and families.
 - c. How will you monitor the data to determine progress?
 - d. How can the State Department of Education help you address the disproportionate identification of minority students in special education?

All seven districts submitted responses in February 2004 (see Appendix 8-Disparate Identification).

In addition, each of these seven (7) districts was invited to participate with other districts with disparate identification in the State Summit on Disproportionate Identification of Students with Disabilities. All seven districts were in attendance.

These districts will be considered for focused monitoring on overrepresentation of racial/ethnic groups in special education through the statewide monitoring process scheduled to begin fall 2004. In addition, all districts in the state will receive copies of the focused monitoring site visit review protocol for use as an in-district self-assessment tool. For further information on disparate identification refer to DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, page 38 and STATE REVIEW OF DATA, page 8.

Monitoring-LRE Data Areas Statewide

On May 30, 2003, the Commissioner sent a letter (see **Second Annual Report-Appendix 20**) requesting each district in the state to review their district's data relative to the goals of the Settlement Agreement and develop and implement an action plan in response to each of the five outcomes of the Settlement Agreement for the 2003-04 school year. Each district was asked to submit a Letter of Assurance to indicate this was accomplished. Forty-one districts did not submit a letter of assurance (see Appendix 9-Monitoring- List of Districts with No ID Action Plan Assurances on file with CSDE).

For the 2004-05 school year, all districts, except the eight (8) IDFM districts will be considered for focused monitoring in the area of LRE. All districts in the state will receive copies of the LRE focused monitoring site visit review protocols for use as an in-district self-assessment tool. These protocols are based on the monitoring tool developed for use with the

eight (8) IDFM districts in the 2003-04 school year (see Appendix 10- Monitoring-IDFM 2003-04 Tools).

ID Focused Monitoring

The most focused monitoring efforts to occur with respect to the Settlement Agreement were again focused on the eight (8) districts selected in April 2002. These districts were Bridgeport, Enfield, Milford, New Haven, Shelton, Waterbury, West Haven and Windham. An additional sixteen (16) districts were also engaged in a heightened focus of monitoring, although not as intense as the initial eight districts. These included Ansonia, Bristol, Danbury, East Hartford, East Haven, Hamden, Hartford, Manchester, Meriden, New Britain, New London, Norwalk, Norwich, Stamford, Wallingford, and Windsor.

Each of these districts was required to have an action plan specifically addressing the goals of the Settlement Agreement. CSDE made grant awards of \$50,00-\$66,600 available to support action plan activities. Grants were approved for twenty-three of the twenty-four districts, with one district (Norwalk) not meeting requirements to receive the award. All districts, as part of their action plan, and as recommended by the EAP, were required to: verify the accuracy of their data and identify strategies to ensure continued accuracy, develop a district-wide team with general and special education teacher and administration membership with parent and student participation encouraged to oversee the action plan, submit data three times during the year to assist in tracking progress, establish targets for each of the LRE goals for one year; and encouraged to set targets for two years. The sixteen districts were required to submit a mid-year report, all districts participated in an end of the year self-assessment process.

The self-assessment process occurred in April 2004 and engaged each district in a self-reflection on accomplishments of the year, yet to be accomplished activities, and plans for next year. Each district had at least one representative in attendance while several districts had multiple participants. The SERC consultant and CSDE consultant that had worked with the district for the past year facilitated the process, and also participated in the assessment.

Further details about this process and the results of each districts' self-assessment are found in Appendix 1-District Reviews.

In July 2004, the CSDE will conduct a summative evaluation (intended as a retrospective evaluation of program efficacy and serves as a final review of the year) of each of the twenty-four districts to determine district progress during the 2003-04 year and to make recommendations for the 2004-05 school year. This review will include analysis of each districts' December 2002 to June 2004 data submission which should reflect student IEPs for the fall 2004, each district's self-assessment, each district's monitoring report (for the 8 districts), each district's midyear report (for the 16 districts), and CSDE consultant's knowledge of district actions and efforts during the 2003-04 school year. A written report will be provided to the Superintendent of each district and the CSDE will conduct a follow up contact. The CSDE expects this summative evaluation to assist the districts in their development of an appropriate response plan, to be completed by September 2004. The CSDE anticipates awarding grant funds to each district again for 2004-05 to support districts' plans. Specific interventions by the CSDE as a result of these summative evaluations may include meetings with school district leaders, including the Superintendent, directing use of federal funds, and/or sanctions.

In January 2005 a formative evaluation (intended to provide feedback for determination of next steps) will be conducted by the CSDE to review the districts' December 2004 data and accomplishments to date on their plans. Specific interventions as a result of these formative evaluations may include meetings with school district leaders, including the Superintendent, directing use of federal funds, and/or sanctions.

16 ID Focused Monitoring Districts

At mid-year the CSDE reviewed the sixteen IDFM districts' December 2002 and 2003 data and mid-year action plan/grant report to determine further action. This mid-year review by the CSDE examined progress made on the LRE goals of the Settlement Agreement and accomplishment of action plan activities. Of the sixteen districts reviewed, the CSDE

determined that no further action by the CSDE was needed in ten of the districts. The remaining six districts were contacted by the CSDE to make the district aware of the CSDE's concern and to discuss future steps. These districts were East Hartford, Hartford, Meriden, New Britain, Norwalk, and Stamford.

All sixteen districts will be considered for site visits for focused monitoring in the 2004-05 school year.

More specific information about each district and CSDE actions with the district are provided in Appendix 1- District Reviews.

8 ID Focused Monitoring Districts

Monitoring for the eight IDFM districts included file reviews, classroom observations, interviews, and submission of data in March and June 2004 in addition to the December 2003 reporting. This monitoring addressed the use of promising practices and supplemental aides and services to support participation in the general education classroom and curriculum. The CSDE consultant assigned to the district selected specific student files, conducted file reviews and classroom observations of these students, and interviewed these students' general education teacher. (see Appendix 10-Monitoring-IDFM 2003-04 Tools). From this information the consultant issued a monitoring report with recommendations and corrective actions as appropriate (see Appendix 11-Monitoring-Sample ID Focused Monitoring Report). Districts were required to submit corrective actions to the Department by April 2004. There were four (4) districts (Bridgeport, New Haven, Waterbury and Windham) with corrective actions covering the following issues: general education teacher not having access to the IEP (3 districts), IEP goals to enable the student to participate and progress in the general curriculum (Bridgeport, Windham), and need for transition planning (Windham). All of the corrective actions have been completed for Bridgeport, New Haven and Waterbury, with Windham's actions still active. The recommendations and corrective actions for each district are found in Appendix 1- District Reviews.

Hearing Officers' Decisions

Since May 22, 2002, there have been three fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions regarding students identified by the hearing officer as having an intellectual disability on an issue related to LRE or an issue related to identification, as reported by the hearing officer. These decisions were monitored for implementation (see description of monitoring system, **Annual Report-September 30, 2002**, pgs. 37-38). This monitoring indicates that the three decisions have been implemented as ordered. Further specifics on impartial hearing requests as related to the Settlement Agreement may be found in the section of this report COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS HEARING, page 75.

Table 14-Fully Adjudicated Impartial Due Process Hearing Results

Impartial Due Process Hearing Requests on Issues for a student with an intellectual disability on LRE or Identification	May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004
Total Requests	10	12
Hearing officer rendered a final decision and order on the issues	2-Parents prevailed in both cases- one for more restrictive programming and the other for more inclusive programming	1-LEA prevailed, for more inclusive programming

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM

As stipulated in the Settlement Agreement, the CSDE has designed and begun to implement a system of technical assistance to be made available to all LEAs to enable them to extend and improve education in regular classes for students with mental retardation/intellectual disability (Section **VI (1) Technical Assistance**, *PJ et al. v. State of Connecticut, State Board of Education et al Settlement Agreement*). In addition, the Settlement Agreement stipulates that as part of that system of technical assistance, federal professional development funds are to be used to provide a sufficient number of qualified specialists to assist LEAs in carrying out their training, supervision and support responsibilities.

The System of Training and Technical Assistance (the System) designed by the CSDE in collaboration with SERC, and through dialogue with the EAP, plaintiffs, RESC personnel and institutions of higher education faculty and administration is described below.

The System is designed to “extend and improve education in regular classes” for students with intellectual disability. All recognize that to assure sustainability and to be effective in this effort, the System needs to address the education of all children, not just students with intellectual or other disabilities. Therefore, the system is designed to be far-reaching in breadth and depth and different facets are being created, developed and implemented at different rates.

The System of TA and Training is multi-faceted and addresses:

- The timing within a professional’s career that TA and Training is provided, including Pre-service and in-service training;
- The people who are to receive the TA and Training, namely Parents, Educators, Support Services Staff, Administrators,
- The entities that are to receive the TA and Training, including individuals, student teams, buildings, districts, higher education faculties, RESC systems, SERC and CSDE; and

- A hierarchy of types and intensity of TA and Training

Timing

In designing a system of TA and Training, in-service training and technical assistance was identified as the most immediate and expedient mechanism to effect change in the delivery of education to students with an intellectual disability in general education classes. While this has been the primary focus of the System, it is recognized that pre-service training will be a long term response, and will be critical for sustainability of the attitudes, knowledge and skills of school personnel to educate students in general education classes.

In-service

SERC, through the use of federally funded professional development monies from the CSDE, has used the in-service model in its delivery of training and technical assistance to school personnel. The manner in which this has been provided is extensively discussed in A Report on SERC Technical Assistance and Professional Development- 2003-04 (Appendix 2).

Pre-Service

Initial dialogues (privately and collectively) were held with several administrators and faculty, as well as adjunct, from higher education institutions, to discuss issues of mutual interest related to the Settlement Agreement. From these conversations an initial collaboration was developed as discussed in the section COACHES ACADEMY AND INDIVIDUAL STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM (see pages 71 and 73, respectively).

Through the engagement of higher education faculty in developing competencies and standards for the Coaches Academy, the transfer of these materials to pre-service curriculum and course development is anticipated. The CSDE recognizes this is in its initial stages and further elaboration of a plan that specifically addresses pre-service training needs to occur. The CSDE intends to meet with the IHEs to continue this planning. In addition, a statewide stakeholder committee, to include higher education, is presently being seated by the Commissioner to revise the current certification continuum including the areas of regulations, teacher preparation-highly qualified teachers and administrators, recruitment, teacher

shortage areas, induction and retention. Issues of relevance to the Settlement Agreement will be addressed during this committee's work.

People

The System of TA and Training has also been designed to address the unique needs of specific role groups of people through the efforts of SERC and CPAC.

SERC

To this end the statewide SERC LRE/Inclusion Initiative has collaborated with several other SERC initiatives to assure that administrators, general classroom teachers, special education teachers, paraprofessionals and support services professionals gain training in the attitudes, knowledge and skills regarding the education of students in general education classes suited to their unique job responsibilities. A review of the SERC initiatives indicates that topics and role-alike groups were provided training and technical assistance throughout this past year. While some trainings addressed only one group, other trainings served multiple role groups simultaneously.

CPAC

In addition, CPAC has collaborated with the CSDE, SERC and other parent organizations to offer and support trainings for parents. For further information, refer to the section PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION, page 81.

Entities

Several groups have been targeted for TA and Training. More specific information about the following can be located in A Report of the SERC Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04 (Appendix 2). These entities include:

1. staff needs that relate directly to an individual student's need- This is described in section INDIVIDUAL STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73.
2. team needs that derive from working together within a classroom or grade level(s)- This is specifically addressed through SERC school-based and statewide training.

Many of the statewide offerings required team participation. An examination of the SERC LRE/Inclusion booklet (Appendix 12) for the 2003-04 school year identifies the variety of team oriented offerings that were provided. A consortium of school teams was created for specific districts that were below the state figures for the Settlement Agreement goals, but not specifically targeted for monitoring.

3. school building needs that deal with governance and oversight-The school-based trainings provided by SERC were specifically building level team oriented for either the twenty-four ID focused monitoring districts or for any other school district's building level teams. Trainings provided for each group included three days of *Step By Step* training from Stetson and Assoc., Inc. In addition, training in the use of the School Based Practices Profile (SBPP) was provided to districts as requested. The SBPP material was widely disseminated with all districts receiving copies from the Commissioner of Education. Technical assistance was provided to the initial 8 IDFM districts as a follow up to *Step By Step*. This TA addressed the district teams' use of the tools and instructional models (including co-teaching and differentiated instruction) presented in the training.
4. district needs to address the issues systemically-In addition to school building level teams attending *Step By Step*, a district level personnel/teams from the ID focused monitoring districts were also required to attend. The intent was to create a knowledge base at the district level so district-wide "capacity building" decisions could be made. SERC TA was made available as a follow up to *Step By Step* to the district level personnel/teams in the initial 8 IDFM districts.
5. institutions of higher education-While more limited this year in scope than other facets of the system, the role of institutions of higher education is recognized as critical for the long term sustainability of the attitudes and skills necessary to educate students with intellectual disabilities in regular classes. Initial dialogues (privately and collectively) were held with several higher education institutions administration and faculty, as well as adjunct faculty, to discuss issues of mutual interest related to the Settlement Agreement. From these conversations an initial collaboration was developed as discussed in section COACHES ACADEMY and INDIVIDUAL

STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, pages 71 and 73, respectively. A further plan will be developed that will include addressing needs related to faculty professional development and curriculum design. The CSDE plans to meet with the IHEs to continue this planning. Additionally, regular updates on the Settlement Agreement have been provided to the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Council with on-going discussion of pre-service education needs. This Council includes representatives from 2 and 4 year institutions of higher education. It should be noted that all of SERC statewide trainings are available to IHE personnel.

6. RESC System's needs to assist LEAs- As the RESC system continues to be responsive to the needs of its clientele (the school districts), a training and technical assistance plan has been designed with the RESC Alliance to address RESC staff professional development needs. In order to provide increased and effective supports to districts, a greater number of RESC staff need to be "retooled" as providers of training and technical assistance to school systems to assist districts in educating students with an intellectual disability in general education classes. Through the Coaches Academy each RESC will receive training and technical assistance for several of their staff.
7. SERC's needs to assist LEAS- As SERC's role in the System of TA and Training is to provide support to districts and building/classroom level teams, SERC consultants must remain highly proficient in the attitudes and skills to support districts in educating children in general education classrooms. Therefore, a professional development plan for SERC consultants has been implemented throughout the year. This has included direct and specific training to SERC consultants by many of the national trainers brought to Connecticut to provide training for district personnel. The topics and accompanying training, while similar to what was being presented to district personnel, was geared to assist SERC consultants in their role as providers of training and technical assistance. In addition, SERC consultants have attended many of the sessions offered through the LRE/Inclusion Initiative, as well as national and regional conferences about educating students in general education classes.

8. CSDE's needs to assist LEAS- CSDE staff need to remain current on the issues and solutions being encountered and solutions implemented by districts. Therefore, CSDE staff has joined with SERC consultants in the professional development trainings and have participated in many of the statewide offerings provided through the SERC LRE/Inclusion Initiative. CSDE consultants have also presented at and attended international and national conferences that address the education of students with disabilities in general education classes. The consultant staff from both Divisions of the Department of Education was also invited to participate in a session in May 2004 on the Settlement Agreement. During this training, consultants, along with the Commissioner and her administrative cabinet, identified areas Department consultants needed to gain knowledge and skills in the issues related to educating students with disabilities and specifically with an intellectual disability in general education classes.

Hierarchy

In order to organize the delivery of services through the System of TA and Training, levels of intervention were established to disburse the TA and Training meaningfully and efficiently. During the 2003-04 school year, as in previous years (see the **Annual Report- September 30, 2002**), three levels of services were provided to school districts and their personnel.

Level I-All Districts

All school districts, private schools and RESCs in Connecticut not identified as a Level II or III district below, had the offerings of the SERC initiatives available to their personnel for a nominal fee. For further detail refer to A Report of SERC Technical Assistance and Professional Development- 2003-04 (Appendix 2). Each district was also given the opportunity for several building level teams to attend three days of *Step By Step* training from Stetson and Assoc. at no cost to their district.

Districts were also able to attend presentations by the CSDE to their Boards of Education (two districts requested-Torrington and North Stonington) and awareness level training

regarding LRE and responsible inclusive practices or disproportionality for their faculties (three districts requested-North Branford, New Britain, and Vernon).

Level II- Districts greater than 10 students with ID whose data is below state figures

During this past year, districts that fell below state figures in several of the LRE goal areas and that had 10 or more students with an intellectual disability, were eligible to apply to send a team to a 5 day consortium on educating students with intellectual disabilities in general education classes. Districts eligible for the consortium were districts that had not been selected for focused monitoring. Several national experts and a Canadian expert presented at these sessions, with follow up technical assistance to each consortium district's team. For further detail refer to A Report of SERC Technical Assistance and Professional Development- 2003-04 (Appendix 2).

Level III-The 24 IDFM Districts

The twenty-four IDM districts were identified in this group during 2003-04. All districts were allowed to register any staff from their district in LRE/Inclusion Initiative offerings at no cost. Each district was also provided the opportunity for several building and district level teams to attend three days of *Step By Step* training from Stetson and Assoc., specifically geared for the twenty-four districts, at no cost. The original eight districts were also provided with no cost technical assistance days as follow up to *Step By Step*. For more specifics, refer to A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development: 2003-04 (Appendix 2).

Summary

This System of Training and Technical Assistance was designed to affect the education of students with an intellectual disability in general education classes at the child, parent, teaching staff, administrative, team, school building and district levels, through pre-service and in-service methods. It was also designed to address professional development needs of the CSDE; SERC; IHE; and RESC personnel whom are in positions to provide training and support to school personnel in this effort.

QUALIFIED SPECIALISTS

The CSDE has utilized federal professional development funds to address the need identified in the Settlement Agreement for a sufficient number of qualified specialists to assist LEAs in carrying out their training, supervision, and support responsibilities. During this second year of implementation of the Settlement Agreement, four areas of engagement continued to occur: (1) increase in the number of professionals within the CSDE and SERC that have the expertise to assist LEAs in carrying out the necessary activities for their schools, staff, parents, and students in addressing the outcomes of the Settlement Agreement; (2) increase in the number of experts from throughout the country that LEAs have been introduced to and made aware of their areas of expertise; (3) identification of existing qualified specialists within Connecticut available to assist schools on specific student issues and school-wide issues; and (4) participation with the RESCs and Universities in creating a system of response that will address pre-service and in-service programs to help insure that instructional teaching coaches and teacher candidates are better prepared for the education of students with developmental disabilities (including intellectual disabilities) in inclusive settings.

Training has occurred for consultants within the Bureau of Special Education (BSE) and SERC to respond to the training and technical assistance needs of implementing the Settlement Agreement. Trainings were on multiple topics and were conducted specifically for BSE and SERC consultants. In addition, BSE and CSDE staff have participated in various professional development opportunities germane to the goals of the Settlement Agreement that are available to all school personnel in CT.

During the 2003-04 school year, SERC has provided statewide training to school personnel on various topics specific to LRE and inclusive programming, with special emphasis given to students with intellectual disabilities and students with severe disabilities. These trainings have been conducted by many qualified specialists from throughout the state and the country (see Appendix 12- LRE/Inclusion Booklet). Through participation in trainings and

workshops, attendees learned from and had opportunities for personal interactions with these experts from around the country to assist them in addressing students' needs in inclusive environments. Participants at these trainings received nationally published materials of the presenters as well as other written information distributed during the trainings. Several districts received on-site technical assistance from these experts as a follow up to the statewide training (see A Report on SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development: 2003-04, Appendix 2)

The third area of focus that was begun last year and continued this year was to address the need for a sufficient number of qualified specialists and the identification of specialists within Connecticut who are available to assist districts either as employees of other state or public agencies; employees of private agencies; or as independent consultants. Last year, with the assistance of the plaintiffs and SERC, CSDE identified twenty (20) individuals (see **Second Annual Report-Appendix 24**) throughout the state. These individuals were recommended as qualified specialists specifically as a result of their skills and knowledge working in educational settings to successfully include children with intellectual disabilities in the least restrictive environment. This group was convened twice in 2002-03 to discuss that portion of the Settlement Agreement related to providing a sufficient number of specialists and again during the spring 2004. The names and contact information of these individuals was disseminated to all school districts with copies available for parents through the CPAC.

During this year's Spring meeting with the group, additional participants were invited. All were updated on the activities of the Settlement Agreement and provided with an overview of the trainings (*Step By Step* and the School Based Practices Profile) that are being extensively provided throughout the state to school personnel. Twelve (12) persons participated in this full day activity.

As a result of participating in the Spring meeting, these individuals will be included in the resource directory which the CSDE anticipates disseminating during summer 2004 to school

districts and parents. This will serve as another vehicle, in addition to last year's list, for school personnel and parents to identify specialists to assist them in their training, supervision, and support responsibilities for educating students with intellectual disabilities in regular classes.

The fourth avenue being pursued is the CSDE's participation with an external provider that will bring the RESC system and IHEs together in the development and implementation of the Coaches Academy and Immediate Response Team. Through the Coaches Academy 50 participants from districts and the RESC systems will be expanding their expertise to address the needs of districts. Further conversations with institutions of higher education are also being pursued to address pre-service training.

For further detail about the interface of CSDE's efforts to build a sufficient pool of qualified specialists to assist districts with CSDE's larger technical assistance system, see TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, pg. 61.

COACHES ACADEMY

Based on recommendations from the EAP, the CSDE will develop an RFP in the summer of 2004 in order to identify an external provider to implement a Coaches Academy. The Coaches Academy will support the in-district support facilitators and consultants from the RESC system in their efforts to educate students in the general education classroom and in their home school. The RFP will be open to the RESC system for their consideration.

The Academy will prepare approximately 50 coaches for a certificate of competence awarded by the Academy. This preparation will include 25 hours of classroom instruction provided by instructors and guest presenters, with an additional 25 hours of job-embedded instruction/demonstration through the use of mentoring instructors. Participant coaches will be required to demonstrate a series of competencies through demonstrations, development of permanent products, written evaluations and the development of a portfolio. The coaches will be selected from the twenty-four targeted school districts, RESC systems, and other qualified participants (i.e., private consultants), as space allows. The intent is to have teams of special and general educators from districts attend who will represent elementary, middle and high school levels.

Instructors, guest presenters and mentor instructors will be selected from the RESCs, Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and private independent consultants with approval from the CSDE. Mentor instructors from IHEs will be assigned to coaches in school districts within the geographic proximity of the IHEs. This will assist in the creation of district/university partnerships for future projects. In addition, similar alignments will be made for RESC coaches, creating the potential for partnerships between RESCs and IHEs.

The participants will be chosen by districts and RESCs based primarily on the individual's experiences with students with cognitive disabilities, educating students in general education classes, participation in collaborative activities with other educators, attitude toward educating students in general education classrooms, and adult training experience.

The district or RESC will receive substitute or other compensatory payment for the 10 FTE days of participation as well as reimbursement for related travel costs. Participant school districts will be required to assure the following:

1. release personnel that are participant coaches from their district as required;
2. allow on-site mentoring to occur in their schools;
3. allow coaches from other districts to participate in mentoring within their school, as appropriate;
4. include the school principal in school mentoring activities, as appropriate;
5. develop a Coaches Role Plan of the coach's responsibilities and district's commitments for the use of the coach upon completion of the Academy; and
6. conduct a meeting among central office and building level special and general education leadership, mentor instructor and coach regarding the implementation of the Coaches Role Plan.

The competencies will be developed by a consortium of invited representatives from the RESC Alliance, Southern Connecticut State University, Central Connecticut State University, the University Center for Excellence (UCONN), CSDE, SERC, parent organizations and other private independent consultants who have expertise in educating students with intellectual disabilities in general education classes. From these competencies, teaching schedules, mentoring schedules, portfolio contents, etc. will be developed by the Coaches Academy instructors.

The consortium to identify competencies, creation of the schedules, hiring of instructors, as well as contact to districts and RESCs to identify coaches will occur prior to September 1, 2004. Instructional hours and job-embedded mentoring will occur September through May, with the first Academy class completed by June 1, 2004 or sooner. Meetings with districts regarding Coaches Role Plans will be held after January 1, 2005.

IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM

At the recommendation of the EAP, the CSDE has created a system to respond to requests for technical assistance to help meet individual student needs. This technical assistance will be contracted with an external provider to begin effective September 1, 2004. During the summer of 2004, a referral system and team will be created that will allow for a planning and placement team (PPT) to make a referral for immediate assistance regarding a specific student. This system will be available for students identified as class members by the CSDE for issues related to the child's education in the home school and/or general education classroom.

The intent of this system is for a student's school team, including the parents, to receive within days of referral, service from a member of the response team. This service would be at no cost to the district, and would include the observation of the student in an appropriate school location specific to the issues, a review of the student's records, and/or interviews with school personnel and parents. From this consultation, the response team member will identify in writing next steps to assist the PPT in its efforts to educate the student in the home school and/or general education classroom. As part of the written next steps, the response team member will provide the PPT with available fee for service resources to assist with implementation. The response team member will, at no cost to the district, conduct a follow up consultation with school personnel and parents within two to three months following the initial contact.

As part of this system of response, an evaluation process will be created to collect and analyze referral data, including number of referrals and presenting issue(s). Student information regarding pre and post referral data on home school, time with non-disabled peers, engagement of the student in classroom instruction, with teachers and with peers in the general education environments and curriculum will also be collected. The data system is not for purposes of evaluating any individual student or district, but to provide feedback regarding the effectiveness of the response team system. Useful information about

interventions and issues encountered will be available for dissemination through written and electronic means, such as posting material on the CSDE website; or including material in the LRE Newsletter.

Personnel identified for the response team will be selected from institutions of higher education, independent private consultants, and/or RESC personnel as approved by the CSDE. These same people may also be instructors, guest presenters and mentoring instructors at the Coaches Academy. The consultations conducted by the response team may also serve as training opportunities for participants of the Coaches Academy with response team members serving as mentor instructors to the Coaches Academy participants (see section COACHES ACADEMY on page 71 of this report.)

COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND IMPARTIAL DUE PROCESS HEARING

The CSDE has recently completed revision of the administrative complaint process to insure consistency with all directives of the U.S. Department of Education regarding the complaint resolution process under the IDEA 34 C.F.R. Section 300.660 as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement. This revision will be distributed to the field in July 2004.

The Bureau conducted a review of all complaints that were filed under the complaint resolution process (34 C.F.R. Section 300.660) from July 1, 2003 through June 1, 2004 for students reported by either party as a child with mental retardation/intellectual disability (MR/ID).

In addition, the Bureau conducted a review of all due process hearings and mediations requested under the Impartial Due Process Hearing (C.F.R. Section 300.507 and C.G.S.10-76(h)) and Mediation (34 C.F.R. Section 300.506 and C.G.S Section 10-76(f)) systems from May 22, 2002 through June 1, 2004 for students reported by the hearing officer in the case of a due process hearing request, or by the parent, district or mediator in the case of a mediation only request, as a child with MR/ID.

Complaint Resolution Process

From July 1, 2003 through June 1, 2004 there were seven (7) complaints filed with the CSDE as defined by C.F.R. Section §300.660, that were identified either on an IEP or by the complainant as concerning a student with an intellectual disability*. Of the seven complaints, two of the complaints were for the same student regarding the same issues for different years. The issues identified for two of the six students were not related to LRE or identification. Of the remaining four students, the IEP did not identify one of the students as having an ID. Of the remaining three students, the allegations included:

- Inadequate notice of PPT meeting, lack of provision of prior written notice, insufficient implementation of LRE placement

- Inadequate time with non-disabled peers, lack of participation in lunch
- Failure to provide notice and conduct PPT, incomplete IEP, inappropriate change in eligibility from multiple disabilities to intellectual disability

These complaints were filed against Stamford, Wolcott and Westport.

Impartial Due Process Hearing Requests

From July 1, 2003 through June 1, 2004 there were 12 requests for an impartial due process hearing.

Table 15: Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings, including those with Mediation Requests, For Students Identified as Having an Intellectual Disability*

Attributes	Number of Requests May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	Number of Requests July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004
Total Requests	10	12
Hearing officer rendered a final decision and order on the issues	2- Parents prevailed in both cases- one for more restrictive programming and the other for more inclusive programming	1- LEA prevailed for more inclusive programming
Withdrawn by party initiating request	4	2
Dismissed by hearing officer	4	9
Mediated-Agreement reached	2	2
Mediated-No agreement reached	3	2
Requested by parent	9 (1 of which was also requested by the district)	11
Requested by district	2 (1 of which was also requested by the parent)	1

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Attributes (continued)	Number of Requests May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	Number of Requests July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004
3-5 year olds	2	1
6-11 year olds	3	3
12-13 year olds	1	2
14-17 year olds	3	3
18-21 year olds	1	2
No age noted	0	1
Parent had an attorney	9	7
Parent did not have an attorney	1	5

Issues, below, are identified by the impartial due process hearing officer.

**Table 16: Issues of Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings
for Students Identified as Having an Intellectual Disability***

Issue	Cases-May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	Cases-July 1, 2003- June 1, 2004
Private Day Placement	3	5
Residential	3	1
Therapeutic Day Placement	0	2
Unilateral placement	2	1
Extended School Year	1	2
Assistive Technology	0	1
Behavior Management	3	3
Inclusive Education	1	3
LRE	4	3
Mainstreaming	2	1
Related Services	0	3
Independent consultant	2	2
Transition services- not secondary	0	1
Evaluation	2	1
Parental Consent for placement	2	2
Procedural Safeguards	1	2
Reimbursement	2	1
Graduation	1	0

**Table 17: Districts Having Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearing
For Students Identified as Having an Intellectual Disability***

May 22, 2002 to June 30, 2003	July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004
Enfield	Bethel
Hartford	Glastonbury
North Haven	Hartford
Portland	New Haven
Suffield	North Branford
Wallingford	Plainfield
Waterbury	Region #5
Westport	Stamford (2)
Winchester (2)	Wallingford (2)
	West Haven

Mediation Requests

From May 22, 2002 to June 30, 2003 there were nine (9) requests for mediation. From July 1, 2003 to June 1, 2004 there were three (3) requests for mediation.

**Table 18: Requests for Mediation for Students Identified
as Having an Intellectual Disability***

Attributes	Number of Requests May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	Number of Requests July 1,2003-June 1, 2004
Total Mediation Requests	9	3
Also requested Impartial Due Process Hearing	5	3
Mediated-Agreement reached	7	2
Mediated-No agreement reached	2	1
3-5 year olds	2	1
6-11 year olds	2	1
12-13 year olds	0	0
14-17 year olds	4	0
18-21 year olds	1	1

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

No age noted	0	0
--------------	---	---

Attributes (continued)	Number of Requests May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	Number of Requests July 1,2003-June 1, 2004
Parent had an attorney	4	1
Parent did not have an attorney	5	2

Issues, below, are identified by the mediator. There may be more than one issue per mediation. Issues were identified in both the mediation and hearing sections of this report if both requests were made.

**Table 19: Issues of Mediations of Students Identified
as Having an Intellectual Disability***

Issue	May 22, 2002-June 30, 2003	Cases-July 1, 2003- June 1, 2004
Private Day Placement/Residential	4	1
Inclusive Education/LRE/Mainstreaming	1	2
Preschool LRE	2	0
Parental Consent/placement	2	1
Related Services	2	1
Extended School Year	0	1
Assistive Technology	0	1
Behavior Management	2	1
Transition services- not secondary	0	1
Evaluation	2	0
Eligibility	1	0
Parental Consent/evaluation	1	0
Reimbursement	1	1
Graduation	1	0

**Table 20: Districts Having Requests for Mediation for Students Identified
as Having and Intellectual Disability***

May 22, 2002 to June 30, 2003	July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004
New Britain North Haven Norwich Meriden Portland Seymour Waterbury Winchester (2)	Glastonbury Wallingford West Haven

PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION

Parent Communication

The CSDE has provided information to parents of class members via written correspondence throughout the year, as well as through response to phone calls and e-mail requests for information. In order to assure that all parents of class members received information, the CSDE updated the data base of mailing addresses in August, 2003. This was accomplished by mailing each LEA a data base listing all students with an intellectual disability who were reported to the CSDE on December 1, 2002 by the LEA. LEAs were required to update the list with students who had been newly identified as intellectually disabled and to provide the most current mailing addresses for the students. A copy of this correspondence is included in Appendix 13-Parent-LEA Data Base Mailing.

Mailings included: updates on training, resources and parent organizations available to families; LRE newsletters; and a parent survey. Each LRE newsletter contained an update on parent training and parent activities. A complete list of mailings is included in Appendix 14-Parent-Mailings: 2003-2004. All written information was provided in English and Spanish. The CSDE also notified parents of class members of other community based trainings of potential benefit, such as USE training, Next Steps training, and state wide conferences.

In addition to mailings to class members, the Connecticut Birth through Five Newsletter contained updates in each issue for families of young children, birth through five. The June 2004 issue is dedicated to the inclusion of preschool children with disabilities, including a lead article written by Rud Turnbull, Co-Director on Disability, University of Kansas. There are a very small number of children under the age of six who are identified as having an intellectual disability in Connecticut. Most young children receive special education and related services under the category of developmental disability. Given that some of these children will become members of the class when re-identified at age six, the CSDE believes

that all families of young children can benefit from this information focused on least restrictive environment.

CSDE – Plaintiff Communication and Meetings

The CSDE, in collaboration with Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC), met with the plaintiffs and interested parent organizations throughout the year. A schedule of these meetings is included in Appendix 15-Parent and CSDE-Organization Meetings. In addition, as suggested by the Expert Advisory Panel, the CSDE met with representatives of the CT ARC and Connecticut Coalition on Inclusive Education (CCIE) on multiple occasions in order to further their involvement in the design of parent activities. This included an opportunity for both organizations to attend the state wide Summit on Disproportionate Identification of Students with Disabilities in CT and attendance at a Focused Monitoring Stakeholder Committee Meeting to design the monitoring of local school districts on issues related to education in the least restrictive environment.

The CSDE has had ongoing discussions with CT ARC and CCIE regarding multiple parent initiatives. Specifically, the Bureau of Special Education has a Continuous Improvement Plan designed to improve parent involvement in the planning and implementation of their child’s educational program. The Bureau utilizes a parent work group that meets with the Bureau on a regular basis to advise in implementation of the improvement plan. A copy of the Parent Participation Work Plan is included in Appendix 16-Parent-Participation Work Plan. Much of the work in the two parent groups is duplicative. The two groups came together for a retreat on June 16, 2004. The purpose of this retreat was to design a way that the two parent work groups can work collaboratively to meet their mutual goals of improving the ability of parents to advocate for their children with disabilities. This combined group will be meeting on a monthly basis over the course of the upcoming year.

One on One Parent Support

The CSDE and CPAC have been meeting with community based organizations regarding the need to provide more community based and individualized information for families. These

initial discussions have included representatives from CCIE, Greenwich ARC (which serves a large population of Latino families in Stamford) and AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Families of Children with Disabilities which serves families in the Hartford and New Haven areas.) The CSDE plans to offer families an opportunity to speak with a parent from a local community based parent organization about the goals of the Settlement Agreement and how it might impact their child's program. In collaboration with these agencies, the CSDE/Bureau has designed training materials to support 1:1 home visits or conversations with families of class members. Through the CSDE contract with CPAC, community organizations will be paid a \$45.00 stipend per home visit to provide this individualized support. This training will take place in July 2004 and, initially, correspondence to families in Stamford and Hartford will be mailed over the summer to offer this support opportunity. If this proves to be a successful strategy to reach families, this initiative will be expanded to other community based agencies throughout the state. The goal is to not only provide information to families about the Settlement Agreement, but to build a relationship with families and community agencies that may support them and provide information throughout their child's educational career.

LEA – Parent Training

There have been two primary initiatives this year that focus on providing additional opportunities and resources for parent training. The first initiative provided training to LEAs to conduct parent training on LRE and the Settlement Agreement. As recommended by the EAP, this effort was specifically designed to provide training to families as locally as possible, and by the district staff with whom they work on a regular basis. In order to build the capacity at the district level, the CSDE and CPAC conducted four trainings for LEA staff and parents. LEAs were asked to bring parents to the meeting so they could include parents as trainers when they conducted training in the district. District staff who attended were from a wide variety of disciplines, including special education directors and teachers, principals, school social workers and psychologists. These trainings provided an overview of parent training materials on the PJ Settlement Agreement, resources for families, commonly asked questions by families and suggestions for conducting an effective parent training.

Participants received a resource packet which included all the materials necessary to conduct the training: CD ROM with power point presentation, resource information and handouts, parent training invitation, and a training evaluation form. All materials were in English and Spanish. In addition, the twenty districts which hosted the training conducted by the CSDE, UCE and CPAC in the previous year received the materials so they could repeat the training. The training materials are currently available on the CSDE web site at <http://www.state.ct.us/sde/deps/PJ/index.htm>.

A complete list of districts who attended the training is included in Appendix x: LEA Participation in Parent Training Sessions. A total of forty-nine districts participated in the training. In addition, numerous additional districts and organizations requested that the CSDE and CPAC conduct this training for parents and staff in district. These trainings are also included in Appendix 17-Parent-List of Districts receiving CSDE/CPAC provided training.

The CSDE plans on conducting a survey of LEAs in the summer 2004 to assess the number of trainings held, the number of parent participants, and the effectiveness of the training sessions. The CSDE has already requested that LEAs submit their plans for 2004-2005 parent education, information and training as part of their IDEA grant application which was submitted in May, 2004. These plans will be reviewed and districts will be contacted to offer support for those initiatives that cover the Settlement Agreement. A copy of this survey is included in Appendix 18: Parent-Participation Plan for 2004-05 School Year.

The second parent training initiative from CSDE was the development of a competitive grant to provide joint training for LEAs and families to develop partnerships in the planning and implementation of IEPs for students with disabilities. The request for proposal (RFP) specifically required strategies to increase the number of families from diverse racial and cultural backgrounds who report participation in training, and satisfaction in their participation in the PPT process. A copy of the specifications for this RFP is included in Appendix 19-Parent-Specifications of Request for Proposal. This grant was initially

designed by the parent work group for the Continuous Improvement Plan on Parent Participation, previously referenced. An initial \$100,000 grant was awarded to CPAC as a result of its proposal being rated highest by a team of scorers. At the recommendation of the grant review team and the Expert Advisory Panel, a second grant was awarded to the A.J. Pappanikou Center on Development Disabilities (UCE) to further increase the number of parents and districts impacted by the training. Parents of class members will receive mailed invitations to these trainings as they occur throughout the next school year. This grant has a very specific evaluation component designed to measure the impact of the training for families and LEAs.

In addition to the above training initiatives, CPAC, in its role as defined in the Settlement Agreement to advise and assist parents of class members to effectively advocate for their children to be educated in the least restrictive environment, has conducted 73 parent trainings for 1,378 parents and professionals. All of the trainings included information about the Settlement Agreement. Some of these workshops were exclusively on the topic of LRE, others were more generally focused on parental rights and the PPT process, but included the topic of LRE. Fifteen of the workshops were conducted in Spanish. CPAC maintains a data base of parents who have participated in these trainings or received information and support from the Center. The number of parents of students with an intellectual disability on the data base has more than doubled in the past year and one-half. Currently, 529 parents of students with an intellectual disability are on the CPAC data base. Since October 1, 2003, 3,000 parents have used the CPAC website on a monthly basis and over 10,000 parents and professionals received CPAC's newsletter *SPEAK OUT*. The newsletter and website include regular updates on the Settlement Agreement and related training activities.

Early Childhood Training

As described earlier in this document, there are few young children in Connecticut identified as having an intellectual disability. To reach out to families, educators and care takers of young children, the CSDE and CPAC have developed training materials supporting the inclusion of preschool children. These materials will be shared with the plaintiff

organizations, the Director of the Connecticut Birth to Three System and the CSDE Preschool Coordinator for feedback prior to piloting this summer.

Survey of Parents of Class Members

To further inform its parent training and information efforts, the CSDE collaborated with Central Connecticut State University and CPAC to survey parents of class members on their reaction to the Settlement Agreement. A complete copy of the survey and results are included in Appendix 20- Parents' Perceptions of the P.J. Settlement Agreement. The response rate to the survey was 679 of 3,200 surveys returned or 21%. Worth noting, CPAC was identified in the cover letter of the survey as a contact for parents who had questions. They received thirty phone calls, primarily from families who were unable to complete the survey due to language or literacy barriers.

The results of the survey indicated that almost three-quarters (74%) of the respondents reported receiving information about the Settlement Agreement from a variety of sources, most frequently mailings and PPT meetings. Almost half (48%) of the respondents reported agreement with the goals of the Settlement Agreement, while 11% reported they were not in agreement. The remaining parents (45%) reported they were not sure as to whether they agreed with the goals. One-quarter (25%) of the parents reported that their child spends most of his or her day in regular education, with a higher percentage of preschool and elementary-aged children than middle or high school students being in regular education classes. Almost three-quarters (70%) of families reported that their child attended their home school. Almost half (42%) of families reported their child participated in extracurricular activities. Over half (65%) reported that placement in regular education classrooms was discussed at the planning and placement team meeting. Over half (58%) reported that strategies to support success in regular education classroom were discussed. An abridged summary of the parent survey results is being designed for families and will be mailed out this summer.

The results of the survey demonstrated the importance of families having accurate information about the Settlement Agreement. Families who reported familiarity with the

settlement were more likely to agree with the goals. A significant number of families remain uncertain regarding the agreement. Also, the phone contacts to CPAC demonstrated the need to develop non-traditional ways to inform families, beyond mailings and formal trainings. The CSDE will continue to identify alternative ways of reaching families and plans to repeat the survey in a year to measure the effectiveness of future strategies.

EXPERT ADVISORY PANEL

Meetings

During the 2003-04 year, the EAP met three times (for a total of eight days) in Hartford as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement. The EAP meetings included public and closed sessions; individual EAP members visits to school districts; EAP meetings with specific target groups (i.e., IHE representatives); and individual EAP members meeting with specific target groups (i.e., school psychologists). Additionally, the EAP members were keynote speakers and session facilitators at the October statewide LRE/Inclusion conference. The meetings were held in October, January and May.

Recommendations

Throughout the year, the EAP made consensus recommendations following each meeting. Following are the consensus recommendations from each of the three meetings and the CSDE’s response to the recommendation, as well as a status report for each recommendation.

EAP Meeting Recommendations for 2003-04

October 9-10, 2003 Meeting		
Item #	EAP Recommendation	Resulting Action
1	Briefings to the EAP on RESC in January	<u>Accepted</u> -data provided at January meeting
2	Eliminate special facility construction under 10-76e for either special school or school wings	<u>Accepted</u> -Memo issued to the Field by Commissioner Sergi ordering a moratorium of 10-76e projects for 03-04. Continued status remains under review.
3	Publish extensively the PJ progress goals 1-5 by district in a ranked order by ERG or similar characteristic. Publish in print and electronically.	<u>Accepted</u> - CSDE has placed district data on the state website regarding each district on each goal of the Settlement Agreement http://www.state.ct.us/sde/deps/PJ/index.htm ; Appendix H, provides districts listed by size and ERG as either above or below state figures on the LRE goals of the Settlement Agreement.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Item #	EAP Recommendation (continued)	Resulting Action
4	EAP to meet with IHE to discuss Dean's chairs Teacher Education/Special Education/Educational Psychology	<u>Accepted</u> -EAP met with three IHE representatives at May 2004 meeting
5	Use SBPP as a formative measure of school and district progress for January session	<u>Accepted</u> -formative evaluation discussed at January meeting; SBPP components to be used in formative and summative evaluation beginning July 2004
6	See Statewide TA System diagram	<u>Accepted</u> -see TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, pg. 61
7	Conduct qualitative (the story behind the numbers) and quantitative data verification	<u>Accepted</u> - see MONITORING; TRAINING, pg. 53 and Appendix 1-District Reviews Monitoring included file reviews, observations and interviews regarding the use of promising practices, supplementary aids and services and progress in the general curriculum.
8	Periodic presentation of qualitative and quantitative data verification	<u>Accepted</u> - Included in this report; expected of each of the 24 IDFM districts during monitoring; anticipate its use as a recommendation of formative and summative evaluation process and statewide random auditing for 2004-05.
9	Conduct school based, family-training linked training	<u>Accepted</u> - see page 81 PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION: LEA Parent Training)
10	Revise ID Guidelines: Talk about educational practice-assessment tied to instruction	<u>Accepted</u> - awaiting written guidance from Dr. Coulter to assist in ID Guidelines revision
11	Revise ID Guidelines: Separate out Social Intelligence- it's a problem	<u>Accepted</u> -awaiting written guidance from Dr. Coulter to assist in ID Guidelines revision
12	Use SBPP as an evaluative tool with link to the process occurring in districts	<u>Accepted</u> - SBPP components to be used in summative and formative evaluation beginning July 2004.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

January 21 and 22 Meeting (recommendations received April 2, 2004)		
Item #	EAP Recommendation	Resulting Action
1	<u>Procedural Recommendation</u> : We find it difficult to work from the flip chart notes. We ask that you provide a secretary to take extensive notes on the discussion leading to flip chart entries. We do <u>not</u> seek verbatim transcripts, just more detail on the discussions.	<u>Accepted</u> - May meeting had typed notes provided to EAP during the meeting
2a	<u>Logistical Recommendation</u> : On Wednesday May 5, Dr. Coulter would like to use the morning availability to talk to data people and school psychologists.	<u>Accepted</u> - meetings held between CSDE data staff and school district psychologists on May 5
2b	<u>Logistical Recommendation</u> : On Wednesday May 5, Drs. Burrello and Freagon would like to visit Bridgeport and see the most impoverished schools; Elementary (Dr. Burrello-) – 3 classes; Secondary (Dr. Freagon) – 3 classes. These schools should have the highest incidence rates of PJ class members.	<u>Accepted</u> - visits made on May 5
3a	<u>Logistical Recommendations</u> : As CSDE notes from the EAP response to the 2003 report, the EAP does not agree that it lacks knowledge/competence as an EAP, to address the goal on overrepresentation. The EAP asks that the May meeting set aside a half day for a comprehensive discussion on that goal and suggest Thursday, May 6, AM session for this purpose.	<u>Accepted</u> - May agenda item
3b	EAP would like to know what steps have been taken to update guidelines as part of the discussion.	<u>Accepted</u> - May agenda item
4	<u>Logistical Recommendation</u> : As an outgrowth of the responses to the 2003 report and the hearing before Judge Martinez, EAP feels it would be helpful and important to hear the perspectives of the Plaintiffs and the State in a closed session in each instance. EAP would like to take up to 1½ hours on Wednesday afternoon or evening to meet with David Shaw, Frank Laski, Peg Dignati, and Ginger Spiers for up to 45 minutes, and separately with CSDE personnel and	<u>Modified</u> - closed session held with all parties present The CSDE rationale for a joint meeting rather than a separate meeting is a desire to keep communication open

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Item #	EAP Recommendation (continued)	Resulting Action
	Ralph Urban for up to 45 minutes. EAP would like to hear the perspectives of both sides in an informal discussion concerning the role and performance of the EAP, free from the constraining influence of the larger group and the opposing sides in the case.	between the CSDE, Plaintiffs and EAP. CSDE staff have worked to maintain transparency in interactions with the Plaintiffs and EAP and do not see a need for privacy in these conversations. CSDE believes private sessions will not contribute to trust which we believe is essential to build with the plaintiffs in our implementation of the Agreement. Private meetings are contrary to our way of operating and we are interested in full disclosure in our dialogue with the EAP and plaintiffs.
5	<u>Logistical Recommendation:</u> EAP would like a review of new data by target districts as thus far compiled in preparation for the June report added to the agenda for Thursday or Friday.	<u>Accepted-</u> May agenda item
6	<u>EAP Recommendation:</u> EAP recommends that the Plaintiffs' parent organizations be directly involved in planning and delivering parent training. EAP realizes they have not competed well in the funding competitions but feel it is essential to a good faith effort to achieve successful outcomes to the goals in PJ to have their perspective represented in the parent training effort. This may require some creativity in the State contracting process.	<u>Accepted-</u> see page 81, PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION: CSDE Plaintiff Communication and Meetings. Second grant awarded to UCE.
7	<u>EAP Recommendation:</u> EAP wishes to reiterate the recommendation from the EAP report that the process of implementing the settlement agreement be driven by general education. EAP asks that you provide us with a written response to that recommendation and indicate	<u>Accepted-</u> see page 110, GENERAL EDUCATION LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Item #	EAP Recommendation (continued)	Resulting Action
	specific steps that will be undertaken as to how this will be achieved. For example, rather than meeting with special education directors at the district level the EAP would like to begin to meet with the Superintendents and their directors for curriculum and instruction.	The May visit was with Bridgeport's Superintendent, Associate Superintendents and Director of Curriculum and Instruction.
8	<u>EAP Recommendation:</u> EAP wishes to reiterate the earlier recommendation in the report that the approach to implementation of the settlement agreement be guided by a program evaluation model that clearly reflects progress by individual LEAs under operational specifications tied to the State's improvement plan. This evaluation model would be directly addressed to outcome data related to each of the goals of the SA. It should clearly show the impact of training and technical assistance interventions as these have occurred to date. EAP recommends that the SEA move away from the kind of process evaluation that has been proposed thus far, as inadequate to this task.	<u>Accepted-</u> see page 113 PROGRAM EVALUATION
9	<u>EAP Recommendation:</u> EAP wishes to reiterate the earlier recommendation from the report that university/district partnerships be formed in all regions of the State where there are target districts. If this approach is to be the "coach's academy" discussed at the last meeting, EAP would like to ask you to address this recommendation in writing providing all of the specifics as thus far detailed including timelines, personnel involved, districts, etc.	<u>Accepted-</u> see page 71 COACHES ACADEMY

May 5-7, 2004		
Item #	EAP Recommendations	CSDE Response
1	Revise Policy Guidelines on identification of ID	<u>Accepted-</u> awaiting Dr. Coulter's report to assist in process
2	Produce data report on students who exited (the PJ Class)	<u>Accepted-</u> CSDE will update reports, though not likely completed for August report See CLASS MEMBERSHIP, pg. 44

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Item #	EAP Recommendations (continued)	CSDE Response
3	Examine any potential categories of student status as a precursor to identification (e.g. Retention) -describe capacity of system for EAP	<u>Accepted</u> -Capacity for this is currently being reviewed and is not anticipated for several years Will sensitize districts on risk factors (i.e.: retention) through focused monitoring on disproportionality
4	For Goal 2 – Provide a rubric for PPTs to consider eligibility -Guidance will be provided from Alan on rubric	<u>Accepted</u> -awaiting Dr. Coulter’s written guidance to incorporate into Guideline revisions
5	Develop LEA Action Plans for 6 disproportionate LEAs Timelines/Benchmarks	<u>Accepted</u> -see DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 38
6	Continue to Collect Information from Practitioners	<u>Accepted</u> - Meeting with practitioners to occur during October EAP meeting with Dr. Coulter
7	Conduct On-Site Visits to Validate Practices	<u>Accepted</u> -EAP visit Spring 2005
8	Provide technical assistance for individual students, clarify details and how attached to a larger system of technical assistance	<u>Accepted</u> - The system for providing technical assistance for individual students and how this technical assistance is linked to a larger system is described in IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73 and TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, page 61, respectively.
9	Parents-continue surveying, possibly sent out with PPT invitation; and emphasize providing support to parents within their community	<u>Accepted</u> - will incorporate recommendations into next surveying cycle, parent group considering sending survey out on postcard at IEP meetings. <u>Accepted</u> -See PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION: One on One parent support and survey of parents and class members, page 81

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Item #	EAP Recommendations (continued)	CSDE Response
10	Develop a list of best practices by bringing together districts w/EAP	<u>Under consideration</u> -consider for program at Expanding Horizon conference
11	Provide description of the system of approach for technical assistance	<u>Accepted</u> - see TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, page 61
12	Develop and conduct Program Evaluation Model at State level	<u>Accepted</u> - to be discussed with evaluators See PROGRAM EVALUATION, page 113
13	Share what is going on at the fall meeting about Paraprofessional training	<u>Accepted</u> - will include on fall EAP agenda
14	Ask CREC for a copy of the protocol use for file review, interview, etc.	<u>Accepted</u> - CREC will provide a copy to CSDE for the EAP to review
15	Send School Psych Guidelines to Dr. Coulter	<u>Accepted</u> - weblink sent
16	Coaches Academy specifics for consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Train & certify 48, 2 from each district (2 or 3 years of this) ➤ Commitment for 1 yr from participants – maybe follow up after this ➤ Must demonstrate participant can teach & teach teachers how to educate students w/ID in gen. ed. class ➤ Job – embedded, IHE coaches & participants come to the student ➤ Boston Literacy Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -watch instruction (6, 8, 10 kids) -principal involved ➤ Assess that these kids (student achievement & behavior) are doing better than kids not in this (research study) ➤ Data collection -achievement -supplem. Aids & services -promising practices ➤ Gen.ed. & spec.ed. co-teaching teams (as much gen.ed. as spec.ed. 	<u>Accepted</u> - see COACHES ACADEMY, pg. 71, for the specific details from these recommendations that are incorporated into the initial start up beginning July 1, 2004

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Item #	EAP Recommendations (continued)	CSDE Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ driven) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interprofessional team (Gen Ed; Spec Ed; Ed Lead; School Psych) ➤ All parties (IHE, RESC) to be involved ➤ Interprofessional training over time ➤ District commitment, principal commitment, alignment with building/district improvement plan ➤ Budget –Professional Development \$, Dean’s grant or probably need to negotiate this <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -split % programmatically between gen/spec ed ➤ Symbiotic relationship is preferred – joint responsibility ➤ Commissioner to Univ. Board of Regents ➤ Incentives for local districts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -substitutes for 16 days -or credits, CEUs, tuition relief ➤ Be aware of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Don't say “this is your responsibility”; incentives work better; more honest conversations at higher levels than faculty level -Spec ed being the lead; must be lead by gen ed -Can’t do w/out principal; must be released & given incentives to be involved ➤ Update staff along the way ➤ Secondary staff maybe engaged as a cohort (one gen, one spec ed) in one of the years ➤ Consider a Departmentalized approach at Secondary <p>IHE will work long term w/districts</p>	

Written Report to the Court

On January 30, 2004, the EAP submitted its first report to the court as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement. Following are consensus recommendations from the report and the CSDE’s response to the recommendation as well as a status report for each recommendation.

EAP Report- January 30, 2004		
Item #	EAP Recommendation	Resulting Action
A. Benchmarks-Measurable benchmarks for each of the goals		
A1.1	By 2005, 90% of students with ID to be in home school	<p>Will utilize EAP benchmarks on graphs and in publications as EAP benchmarks.</p> <p>Will continue to require districts to establish district benchmarks.</p>
A2.1	By 2005, 75% mean time of students with ID to be with non-disabled peers	<p>CSDE will utilize EAP benchmarks on graphs and in publications as EAP benchmarks.</p> <p>Will continue to require districts to establish district benchmarks.</p> <p>CSDE requests EAP to provide the references for the research literature that scientifically supports this target</p> <p>CSDE will provide the field with related statistics for “all disability” in CT (55%) and how CT compares to the country. Also will provide ranges and medians of federal data.</p>
A3.1	By 2005, 40% of students with ID to be in regular class 79% or more of the day	<p>Will utilize EAP benchmarks on graphs and in publications as EAP benchmarks.</p> <p>Will report CT in context of where the state was relative to the country before the SA and since.</p>

		<p>Provide ranges and medians of federal data for the class.</p> <p>Will continue to require districts to establish district benchmarks.</p> <p>The CSDE requests the EAP to explain further the rationale used in the EAP report which said “80% is reasonable”. What scientifically based research supports this figure as reasonable? The CSDE did not see this as a rationale, but more of an opinion with a lack of information to back it up.</p> <p>EAP needs to provide a rationale/the references for the research literature that supports this target</p>
A3.2	By 2007, 80% of students with ID to be in regular class 79% or more of the day	<p>Will utilize EAP benchmarks on graphs and in publications as EAP benchmarks.</p> <p>Will report CT in context of where we were relative to the country before the SA and since.</p> <p>Provide ranges and medians of federal data for the class.</p> <p>Will continue to require districts to establish district benchmarks.</p> <p>The CSDE requests the EAP to explain further the rationale used in the EAP report which said “80% is reasonable”. What scientifically based research supports this figure as reasonable? The CSDE did not see this as a rationale, but more of an opinion with a lack of information to back it up.</p>

		EAP needs to provide a rationale/the references for the research literature that supports this target.
A4.1	% of students with ID participating in extracurricular activities (including competitive activities) in each school should equal or exceed the % of typical students' participation	<p>Will utilize EAP benchmarks on graphs and in publications as EAP benchmarks.</p> <p>Will continue to require districts to establish district benchmarks.</p> <p>The CSDE will provide data on other disability categories percentage of extracurricular participation and results of survey to provide further guidance to districts on establishing targets.</p>
A5.1	Establish a benchmark for non-discriminatory assessment	<p>The CSDE requests further explanation from the EAP. It is not clear what is intended by this recommendation.</p> <p>CSDE will report CT in context of where the state was relative to the country before the SA and since regarding incidence.</p>
A6.1	All trend analysis should be done on the basis of actual not projected data	This issue was immediately rectified following the October 2003 EAP meeting and the CSDE no longer conducts trend analysis on projected data .
B. Data Collection and Reporting		
B1.1(a)	Each school within each targeted district targeted (24) prepare a bi-monthly progress report on class members and their movement across the goals of the Settlement Agreement for the CSDE.	<p>The CSDE will be requiring a January and June progress report following the districts' submission of December 1 and June 30th data.</p> <p>The statewide data collection for</p>

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

		<p>all districts in the state annually. In addition, the CSDE collects data from the targeted 24 districts in March, June and September. From these data, district-level reports are generated that document the activities of active ID students, as well as track students that exit throughout the year. The CSDE believes that these three data collections for the targeted 24 are capable of capturing the movement of students in the Class across the 5 goals. The CSDE does not believe that adding three additional data collection points is likely to reveal significantly more information about student progress than is captured by the current data collection and reporting system. Furthermore, the CSDE feels that current data collections are strategically timed so as to be capable of offering feedback to districts in time for PPTs that convene in the spring and fall.</p>
B1.1(b)	<p>These data (B1.1(a)) should be reviewed bi-monthly with the Superintendent of each school, Asst. Comm. Coleman and Chief Dowaliby in Hartford.</p>	<p>Meeting in January following the December data collection; district's mid year progress report and CSDE formative evaluation; and then potentially again in June following the June data collection; district's end of year progress report and CSDE summative evaluation with Ass. Comm. and Chief, as appropriate to the degree of progress being made by the district.</p>
B1.1(c)	<p>Progress should be reviewed across the districts, monthly goals yet to be attained should be identified and strategies that work for students and staff should be shared.</p>	<p>CSDE will incorporate this recommendation into district grant/action plans</p>

B2.1	<p>Any year to year data discrepancies regarding participation in home school and extracurricular activities should be audited by the CSDE for any LEAs that show discrepancies from year to year.</p>	<p>The first two years of extracurricular participation data were compared and audits on this data were carried out for the 8 districts. A description of the audit results can be found in the Second Annual Report, pg. 51</p> <p>Upon districts' submission of June 04 data, CSDE, during summative evaluations, will determine if auditing is needed on the 03-04 home school and extracurricular participation data based on discrepancies between the 02-03 and 03-04 figures.</p> <p>CSDE will determine the extent of the discrepancy that would justify an audit. Decision rules regarding whether or not data are deemed "audit-worthy" will likely incorporate information from districts' action plans. If an action plan would reasonably support a large improvement in either home school attendance or extra-curricular participation, it is likely that the CSDE will not audit as these are anticipated discrepancies in year-to-year data.</p>
B3.1	<p>Disaggregation of data by ethnicity- CSDE should annually disaggregate the data to determine the progress of ethnic groups of children on the five goals.</p>	<p>Goal #2 of the settlement agreement mandates the reduction of disparate identification of students with intellectual disability by racial/ethnic group. The CSDE is committed to analyzing data on incidence and prevalence in terms of race/ethnicity as the CSDE moves forward with efforts to address the issue of disproportionate identification of minority students as ID/MR. There is no provision in the settlement agreement that compels the CSDE to disaggregate LRE data (data that addresses the other 4 goals of the</p>

		settlement agreement) by racial or ethnic groups. The CSDE works with districts to design interventions tailored to their unique and specific needs. In some cases, information on LRE measures disaggregated by race/ethnicity may help CSDE inform practice at the district level. Decisions about when the disaggregation of LRE data by race/ethnicity is needed to affect change will be made on a case by case basis by the CSDE
B4.1	CSDE should annually disaggregate data by age (3-4 yrs.; 5-11; 12-13; 14-18; and 19-21) in order to determine any trends by age group, refine LEA planning and to better ensure effective transitions between age-level buildings and programs.	The CSDE is reviewing the need to disaggregate data by specific grade configurations (e.g., k-5, 6-8, 9-12) that align with many districts in CT. In specific districts the CSDE is interested in analyzing the data to determine if it yields a distinct difference in TWNDP data for younger students compared to older students.
B5.1	To avoid inappropriate “migration” to other disability categories, conduct a thorough examination of changes by age level in the data regarding disability classification.	Refer to section CLASS MEMBERSHIP, pg. 44
B6.1	Data regarding the number of due process cases related to aspects of the Settlement Agreement should be presented annually to the EAP for their analysis and recommendations	Refer to section COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS page 75
B7.1	A postcard evaluation system should be developed for parents to indicate their feelings about their participation in the PPT, school-based planning and evaluation of the school implementation progress.	Survey conducted with class members’ parents (see Appendix 20-Parents’ Perceptions of the PJ Settlement Agreement) to address this as postcard size did not allow for both English and Spanish. Parent Committee is considering distribution of post-card at IEP meetings to survey satisfaction.

B8.1	SERC needs to develop technical assistance plans that are measurable	The CSDE requests further explanation from the EAP. It is not clear what is intended by this recommendation.
B9.1	1/3 of the EAP time in-state should be to gather information and support local implementation through site visits to schools, conference participation, etc.	This is being accommodated. The EAP needs to state clear purpose and outcomes in advance of the visit, so the visit can be coordinated to assure best effort to address the purpose.

C. Locus of State and LEA Leadership

C1.1	Responsibility for PJ should be moved from Bureau of Special Ed to the Associate Commissioner of Educational Program and Services.	See GENERAL EDUCATION LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP, page 110
C1.2	Develop an integrated ad hoc task force drawn from curriculum staff of Dr. Coleman in literacy and mathematics and from G. Dowaliby's staff on special assignment to PJ to oversee a statewide technical assistance system that ties district and school capacity building to individual students with intellectual disabilities and its implementation, monitoring and evaluation.	CSDE needs further clarification of this recommendation.

D. Building Capacity

D1.1	Develop an RFP to create an Instructional Coaches Academy with an external provider.	Refer to COACHES ACADEMY, page 71 CSDE is utilizing an RFP process to identify an external provider.
D1.2	Through the Academy link IHEs and pre-service teachers with a rich field-based curriculum and practicum	While the Coaches Academy would link IHEs, the inclusion of pre-service teachers still needs to be developed.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	experiences.	Refer to COACHES ACADEMY, page 71 and TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, page 61 for further explanation of the link with IHEs and plans for addressing pre-service.
D2.1	Current external consultants should join IHE teacher education faculty in creating curriculum and providing on-site coaching in the 24 targeted school systems.	Included in COACHES ACADEMY, page 71
D2.2	General and special ed teams from elementary, middle and high school level should be invited to be the initial trainees in the Academy	Included in COACHES ACADEMY, page 71
D3.1	50 highly qualified professionals per year for the next three years should be developed to constitute a group of technical assistants in the State to build local capacity statewide along with a cadre in each school district.	Included in COACHES ACADEMY, page 71 Coaches Academy participants from districts will build in-district capacity and RESC participants will build the group of technical assistance providers for the Immediate Student Response Team, see pg. 73, and/or for fee for service to districts..
D3.2	Each district should identify at least two lead program developers to work with an external team of technical training coaches to provide in-classroom coaching for all general education lead teachers and special education support teachers working to increase the quality of instruction an time with non-disabled peers for students in the class.	Mentoring instructors are included in the COACHES ACADEMY, page 71
D4.1	Within each of the 24 targeted LEAs, at least two lead program developers be identified to work with an external team of technical training coaches to provide in-classroom coaching for all general education lead teachers and	Same as D3.2 Refer to COACHES ACADEMY, page 71

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	special education support teachers working to increase the quality of instruction an time with non-disabled peers for students in the class.	
D4.2	The EAP suggested the City of Boston’s literacy coaching model which uses a coaching protocol where a lead coach supports groups of eight teachers and their Principal who learn through in-classroom demonstrations how to teach language arts and English.	Refer to COACHES ACADEMY, page 71 for explanation of system
D4.3	This model (D4.2) takes place in an eight-week process consisting of framing the approaches, demonstrating through actual teaching with group observation, and debriefing. The practice team is released one day a week for eight weeks to participate.	Refer to COACHES ACADEMY, page 71
D5.1	Incorporate a back-up system of technical assistance where skilled educators are able to respond within two working days to requests from individual districts or parents for technical assistance for individual children, their teachers and their families.	This system is detailed in section IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73
D5.2	These individuals (D5.1) should be able to be on-site in the child’s school and classroom)(s) to conduct observations, demonstrate effective strategies, identify resources and meet with school personnel and families to resolve issues, that might result in the child’s removal from the general education classroom.	This system is detailed in section IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73 The Coaches Academy will be training RESC personnel to also serve districts on a fee for service basis.
D5.3	These individuals (D5.1) should be available to participate in individual school and district in-service training programs for general and special educators.	Refer to IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73 The Coaches Academy will be training RESC personnel to also serve districts on a fee for service basis.
D5.4	Individuals (D5.1) should keep	Detailed records will be kept as part of

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	detailed record of the problems addressed and the strategies used to ameliorate them.	the Immediate Student Response Teams responsibilities. Refer to IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73
D5.5	This record should be posted on the CSDE website for dissemination and possible replication.	Useful information about interventions and issues encountered will be available for dissemination through written and electronic means, such as posting material on the CSDE website; or including in the LRE Newsletter. Refer to IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, page 73
D5.6	This back-up system (D5.1) is especially important when children are returned to their home school where teachers have not had prior experience with them and where student may have considerable needs for curricular modification, adaptations and behavioral intervention plans.	This example of when the system would be useful could be used in publicizing the Immediate Student Response Team. This recommendation will be given to the external provider of the team.
D6.1	Funding targeted school change- Reconsider the application for the school-wide model RFP to make the funding competitive.	Grant funding is available to 24 IDFM districts for the 2004-05 school year. CSDE will encourage districts to consider competition among their district's school buildings or feeder chains when determining the distribution of their grant funds.
D6.2	The RFP (D6.1) should be designed to include an elementary, middle and high school if possible, but not to exclude a single building from applying.	Grant funding is available to 24 IDFM districts for the 2004-05 school year. CSDE will encourage districts to consider competition among their district's school buildings or feeder chains when determining the distribution of their grant funds.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

D6.3	Identify three high schools as pilot sites to create new models to implement the Settlement Agreement.	To be considered. CSDE's priority is to get Coaches Academy and Immediate Response Team grants up and going
D7.1(a)	Develop a cadre of IHE Faculty in partnership with local school districts that can support implementation of the Settlement Agreement.	Mentoring instructors from IHEs will be assigned to district and RESC personnel based on geographic proximity to facilitate partnerships. Refer to COACHES ACADEMY, pg. 71
D7.1(b)	Consider providing grants to the regional universities across the state to form partnerships with the targeted districts.	Money would flow through Coaches Academy to IHEs. Mentoring instructors from IHEs will be assigned to district and RESC personnel based on geographic proximity to facilitate partnerships. Grants to be considered for future.
D7.2	Develop a program approval process for IHE teacher and administrative preparation that supports a merged system of supportive education for all students consistent with PJ	Current teacher certification continuum being examined by statewide stakeholder committee. Topic to be included in committee discussions.
D7.3	Develop an IHE/school district small grant program to foster partnerships to assist in the implementation of PJ	See response to D7.1(b), above.
D8.1	Parents should be represented in the development and/or implementation of all the afore-discussed items.	Parent organization representative to be on Coaches Academy competencies development consortium. Further involvement to be considered in future as planning for Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team. Relevant input from the parent workgroup will also be considered.

E. Technical Assistance for Instruction and Environment		
E1.1	Target of technical assistance needs to be instruction and environment leading to student results	<p>Technical assistance will be identified by the district in collaboration with SERC and CSDE to focus on this, as appropriate to the needs of the district.</p> <p>To review this past year's efforts, see <u>A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04- Appendix 2</u></p>
E1.2	Target of technical assistance needs to be classroom instruction and environment that is welcoming and effective.	<p>Technical assistance will be identified by the district in collaboration with SERC and CSDE to focus on this, as appropriate to the needs of the district.</p> <p>To review this past year's efforts, see <u>A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04, Appendix 2</u></p>
E1.3	Focus should be shifted to district accountability for results and away from expression of awareness, access and introductory skills.	<p>Technical assistance will be identified by the district in collaboration with SERC and CSDE to focus on this, as appropriate to the needs of the district.</p> <p>To review this past year's efforts, see <u>A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04, Appendix 2</u></p>
E1.4	Focus on instruction in the classroom and on skill building related to beliefs and values.	<p>Technical assistance will be identified by the district in collaboration with SERC and CSDE to focus on this, as appropriate to the needs of the district.</p> <p>To review this past year's efforts, see <u>A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04, Appendix 2</u></p>
E1.5	Both general and special education teachers need to see all students learning what they want them to learn and be able to see evidence of progress.	<p>Job-embedded training is a part of the Coaches Academy, see COACHES ACADEMY, page 71</p> <p>Technical assistance will be identified by the district in collaboration with</p>

		<p>SERC and CSDE to focus on this, as appropriate to the needs of the district.</p> <p>Spotlight visits continue to be encouraged.</p> <p>Mentoring district partnerships are being developed through SERC's training initiatives for next year..</p>
E1.6	<p>Teachers need to see the learning occur in the settings where they control the time and the work they give students both in the content and social areas of the curriculum.</p>	<p>Job-embedded training is a part of the Coaches Academy, see COACHES ACADEMY, page 71</p> <p>Technical assistance will be identified by the district in collaboration with SERC and CSDE to focus on this, as appropriate to the needs of the district.</p> <p>Spotlight visits continue to be encouraged.</p> <p>Mentoring district partnerships are being developed through SERC's training initiatives for next year..</p>

Other Information

The January 2004 EAP report followed an earlier version submitted in October 2003 by the EAP to the court, plaintiffs and defendants. The court requested a conference with the plaintiffs and defendants, at which time a ruling was issued. The ruling required the CSDE and plaintiffs to submit a response to the report to the court, EAP and the other party in order for the EAP to consider all responses and reissue their report based on the responses of the parties by January 30, 2004. The court also ordered that the plaintiffs and defendants meet with the court in March for discussion.

The EAP submitted a second report on January 30, 2004 and the plaintiffs and defendants met with the court on March 2, 2004 to discuss progress to date in light of the January 2004 EAP report. Following this meeting, the court ordered the EAP to submit their next written

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

report more immediately following the CSDE Annual Report of June 30, 2004. The date for the EAP report was set for July 30, 2004.

At the May 2004 EAP meeting, the EAP, plaintiffs and defendants discussed and agreed to petition the court for a revision to this order, requesting a September 30, 2004 reporting date. This would allow the CSDE to provide the EAP with the most current data available on districts to be used in their report. Since new district data would not be available and useable until August, the CSDE could not include this in the **Third Annual Report- June 30, 2004**, and thus, the EAP could not use this data in their report if needing to submit by July 30, 2004. The court revised the order.

As ordered by the court, September 30, 2004 is the submission date for the second report of the EAP to the court, plaintiffs and defendants.

GENERAL EDUCATION
LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP

The EAP recommended that the locus of leadership for this initiative at the state and district levels, and emphasis of training and technical assistance at the district level, be situated with and driven by general education. The CSDE has embraced this recommendation with a series of critical actions and directions.

Bureau Relocation

In April 2004 Commissioner Sternberg, in consultation with Associate Commissioner Coleman, decided to move the Bureau of Special Education from separate Middletown offices to the State Office Building, in Hartford. Thus the Bureau of Special Education is in hallway proximity to the general education bureaus of the Division of Teaching and Learning, including the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction. This closer proximity has already allowed for more frequent and familiar contact, conversations, planning meetings and trainings, among staff in the above Bureaus.

Department Meeting

In May 2004 the Commissioner and both CSDE Associate Commissioners held a Department-wide meeting for all educational consultants throughout the Department. The purpose was twofold purpose: (1) to provide an overview and a status report on the goals of the PJ Settlement Agreement and progress to date on those goals, and (2) to engage in a dialogue with the consultants regarding the significance of the Settlement Agreement to each consultant's assignments, and how to incorporate the goals of the Settlement Agreement into their work with districts.

After this meeting, a smaller group of key individuals including the Commissioner, both Associate Commissioners, the Bureau Chiefs of Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, and Early Childhood and Social Services, as well as consultants from these Bureaus met to continue the conversation. From this meeting the Department established

four areas of focus to better unify the a Department of Education in its efforts, both internally and when engaging with school districts. The focus areas were policy, training, systems and families/community. Within each of these focus areas, elements of Department work were identified that needed to be revised or created to promote a unified effort. The group recommended that ad hoc groups be established to address the specifics of each area with a representative leader from each group serving on an oversight committee, with the Associate Commissioners as co-leaders.

Next steps are being discussed at the Commissioner's cabinet level.

Communication and Training

The manner in which communications regarding the Settlement Agreement are disseminated has changed. Historically, mailings were sent primarily from SERC or the Bureau Chief of Special Education to Directors of Special Education. During this past year, a conscious effort has been made to send correspondence from the Commissioner or Associate Commissioner to the Superintendent of Schools. Meetings are being held more frequently between SERC and CSDE consultants with Superintendents and districts' central office general education curriculum and instruction administrators rather than the previous practice of meeting solely with the Director of Special Education.

SERC trainings, which previously requested building principals' participation, are now requiring building level administrators to be in attendance at building team trainings. While special education administrators are not excluded from trainings, the strong message in the announcements of trainings; and in the focus of trainings, is more directed to a general education teacher and administration audience. Participation of general education colleagues within the Coaches' Academy as instructors, mentors and participants is also being strongly encouraged. Central office and building level general education administrators are required to be on the district planning teams to implement the Settlement Agreement action plans and the SERC technical assistance plans.

All efforts to address goal #2 (disparate identification) are through joint general education and special education leadership and the Commissioner's Office liaison from the CSDE. Stakeholder planning committee members are from many arenas (schools, communities and institutions of higher education), and district Summit participants are overwhelmingly districts' general education leadership and staff.

In early June 2004, the Commissioner arranged to meet with all Superintendents and their central office general education curriculum administrators to engage in a dialogue about the education of all students in general education classes, and the PJ Settlement Agreement's relationship to this issue (see Appendix 21- Commissioner's May 21, 2004 correspondence to Superintendents on Brown V. BOE). Unfortunately, due to unforeseen scheduling issues, the meeting was postponed and will be rescheduled at a later date this summer (see Appendix 22- Commissioner's May 27, 2004 postponement correspondence).

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The CSDE is in agreement with the EAP recommendations regarding the adoption and implementation of an external systems change program evaluation model. The basic assumption underlying this program evaluation is that the LRE Initiative can be represented as an interrelated series of parts that work together to create change to produce benefit (outcomes) for the initiative's target population. The CSDE is interested in a program outcome evaluation model that will examine the relationship between activities, inputs/resources, and outputs/results that support the overall initiative outcomes.

The CSDE will move forward with this program evaluation model over the next several months, beginning with a preliminary meeting with a Connecticut-based Policy and Evaluation Center. Last January, the EAP recommended Dr. Fetterman of California and his empowerment evaluation theory as a starting point for developing a LRE Initiative evaluation. As a result, the CSDE sent a representative to the American Evaluation Association annual meeting to listen to Dr. Fetterman and have incorporated much of his work into the formative (feedback) and summative (final) evaluation activities with the twenty-four targeted local school districts. These districts have each formed local LRE stakeholder groups who are working on participant-driven process evaluations of their district-level efforts. While the goal of these evaluations are input/process driven, the goal of the external systems change program evaluation is more global in nature and seeks to assess the LRE Initiative's statewide outcomes rather than local outputs/results.

The purpose of this outcomes program evaluation is to determine if the LRE Initiative is effectively making a difference for students with Intellectual Disabilities. Although improved accountability is a major force behind outcome evaluation, there is an even more important reason: to help improve services. This outcome evaluation will create a learning loop that feeds information back into the CSDE on how well the initiative is affecting student outcomes. The evaluation should produce findings the department can use to adapt, improve, and become more effective in the implementation of the LRE Initiative.

While the evaluation has not been completely designed to date, the CSDE along with the EAP has narrowed the focus of the evaluation to four possible questions:

- Has the choice to implement the LRE Initiative as a “focused” system of intervention around the goals of the LRE Settlement resulted in a statewide effect/systems change?
- What is the main factor(s) contributing to whether a targeted district is making significant continuous progress or is stagnate in their efforts regarding the settlement goals?
- What is the sustainability of the LRE Initiative? Is LRE imbedded into other statewide non-settlement structures?
- Is the focus of the LRE Initiative on students with intellectual disabilities having any impact on the other 12 federal disability groups?

In its development, the model will be expanded and represented graphically in order to demonstrate the relationship of all components contributing to the evaluation. A level of detail will emerge as the model is created with the evaluator. For example, the relationship of the State-level system to the district-level systems, and their relationships to each other will be carefully spelled out, including common outcome measures across all 24 districts, and any measures unique to each district. The participant driven evaluation strategies will enable the external evaluator (CSDE) to see how different processes are differentially affecting common outcome measures.

ACTIVITIES 2004-05

Monitoring and Assistance -LRE

During the upcoming 2004-05 school year, the CSDE will be conducting LRE monitoring that will encompass several tiers of intervention:

Eight (8) IDFM Districts-Year 1 IDFM Group

Each of the eight districts will be required to develop a 2004-05 response plan to address the CSDE's summative evaluation report scheduled to be completed in July 2004.

The eight (8) IDFM districts will be expected to implement this action plan, submit mid-year and end of year progress reports and submit data reports in December 2004, March 2005 and June 2005. Each district will set December 2004, March 2005 and June 2005 targets for each LRE goal of the Settlement Agreement.

These districts will also be engaged in monitoring regarding progress in the general curriculum through a pilot study. This technical assistance/pilot study will examine student progress as reflected by IEP goals and objectives (educational benefit), overtime. This monitoring will assist in creating tools to be used throughout the state for all districts to assess educational benefit.

SERC technical assistance will continue this year from September 2004 through January 2005 at no cost to the district, to assist these eight districts with implementation of their action plans. CSDE grant money will also be available upon approval of their grant application.

Sixteen (16) IDFM Districts-Year 2 IDFM Group

Each of the sixteen districts will be required to develop a 2004-05 response plan to address the CSDE's summative evaluation report, scheduled to be completed in July 2004.

The sixteen IDFM districts will be expected to implement this action plan, submit mid-year and end of year progress reports, and submit data reports in December 2004, March 2005 and June 2005. Each district will set December 2004, March 2005 and June 2005 targets for each LRE goal of the Settlement Agreement.

The sixteen (16) IDFM districts will be monitored through the statewide LRE focused monitoring process being initiated in the Fall 2004. During late summer 2004, these districts along with other selected districts throughout the state will receive focused monitoring letters requesting an explanation of the districts data on LRE. More specifically, these sixteen districts will need to address the goals of the Settlement Agreement for students with intellectual disabilities and identify a response plan to these goals, as described above.

Based on a review of the data and district responses to the CSDE, these districts may then be selected for a site visit for the statewide LRE focused monitoring that will begin in January 2005.

SERC technical assistance will be available to a select group of these sixteen based on the CSDE's summative evaluation of each district that is scheduled to be completed in July 2004. Technical assistance will be provided from September 2004 through January 2005 at no cost to the district, to assist them with implementation of their action plan. CSDE grant money will also be available for all sixteen districts upon approval of their grant application.

Year 3 IDFM Group

For the 2004-05 school year an additional group of districts will be identified based on the number of students with an intellectual disability and data that falls being below the state figures for multiple goals of the Settlement Agreement. These identified districts will be notified of the CSDE's specific concerns and have access to SERC trainings related to the LRE/Inclusion Initiative at no cost to district personnel. *Step By Step* training will also be offered at no cost to the district for multiple building teams to attend during a fall 2004 series of sessions.

All Districts in State

All districts in the state will be required to revise their ID action plans initially developed during the 2003-04 school year, and establish new targets for December 2004-05 and December 2005-06. Letters of assurance will be requested to be on file at the Bureau of Special Education indicating the plan has been developed and is being implemented. Random checks of districts will be conducted throughout the year. To assist in revising their action plan, all districts in the state will receive copies of statewide and district specific data, as well as the LRE focused monitoring site visit review protocols. These protocols, based on the monitoring tool developed for use with the eight (8) IDFM districts in the 2003-04 school year (see Appendix 10- Monitoring-IDFM 2003-04 Tools) may be used as an in-district self-assessment tool to inform the district's action plan.

Monitoring and Assistance-Disparate Identification

East Hartford, Manchester, New Britain, New Haven, Norwalk, Windham, and Windsor were identified based on 2002-03 data as having disproportionate identification of students with an intellectual disability by race and ethnicity. In addition, New Haven, Waterbury and West Haven disproportionately identified students by gender (high for males).

Districts from this list may be considered for a site visit as part of the Focused Monitoring in the area of disproportionate representation, which is one aspect of the statewide focused monitoring efforts to be implemented the fall of the 2004-05 school years. An additional 3 districts (Groton, Stratford and Trumbull) while not significantly disproportionate, based on their identification patterns did have high odds ratios for black students in the category of intellectual disability in their preliminary 2002-03 data. CSDE believes this pattern of identification warrants explanation. Three additional districts- Bristol, Cheshire, Wallingford- also have disproportionate gender patterns (high for males). All six (6) of these districts will be receiving letters from Commissioner Sternberg requesting districts to

explain how they are addressing the issue of disproportionate identification, whether identified due to race, ethnicity and/or gender.

Training and Technical Assistance

The specifics of activities for 2004-05 regarding the system of technical assistance may be found in the following locations: A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04 (Appendix 2); COACHES ACADEMY, pg. 71; IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, pg. 73; and TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, pg. 61.

EAP

The EAP plans to meet three times during the 2004-05 school year in Hartford as stipulated by the Settlement Agreement. These dates include October 21 and 22, January 10, 11 and 12, 2005 and May 11, 12 and 13, 2005. These date include site visits by EAP members to local districts. In addition, the EAP, in connection with the October meeting, will conduct presentations at the October 20th statewide LRE/Inclusion conference (Expanding Horizons) and participate in a forum for school principals later that same day. At the request of the plaintiffs, the CSDE and EAP have agreed to include in each EAP meeting an opportunity for public comment. The schedule for public comment will be advertised for each meeting.

By September 30, 2004 the EAP will submit its second written report to the Court, Plaintiffs and CSED. Refer to EXPERT ADVISORY PANEL for further specific regarding this submission.

Parents Activities

CSDE and CPAC will continue to meet with the plaintiffs and parent groups around the state to assist in the design and implementation of future parent initiatives. There will be monthly meetings of the newly combined CIPT Parent Work Group and the LRE/PJ Parent Work Group. Initiatives planned for next year include:

- A survey of school districts to assess effectiveness of training they have conducted;

- A survey of parent organizations regarding training related to the Settlement Agreement and LRE and to assess their needs for additional information;
- LEA/Parent training: Families as Partners: School-Family Collaboration in the Education of Students with Disabilities:
- Community based training for families of young children;
- In collaboration with CT ARC and CCIE, two workshop sessions at the Expanding Horizons Conference will be conducted;
- Identification of success stories in CT and parent panel presentations of success stories at Expanding Horizons conference;
- Development of 1:1 support for families through community based agencies;
- Options and Opportunities training, as requested by LEAs and parent organizations;
- Training for LEAs on how to conduct effective parent training on Settlement Agreement and LRE; and
- Ongoing communication with families of class members, including updates in the LRE newsletter.

Data

Throughout this report other activities of the CSDE related specifically to data analysis and display of data may be found; refer to the **EAP January 2004 Report Recommendations**, pg. 96.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

TABLE INDEX

Table	Page of Annual Report	Title of Table
1	8	Table 1-State Goals 1, 3, 4, and 5 from 1998-2003
2	9	Table 2- State Goal 2-Incidence Rate from 1998-2003
3	10	Table 3- State Goal 2-Male Gender Rate from 1998-2003
4	11	Table 4- State Goal 2 Race/Ethnicity Rate from 1998-2003
5	15	Table 5-Data for Districts with 20 or more students with ID, not including the 24 IDFM Districts
6	22	Table 6-Eight (8) IDFM Districts
7	27	Table 7-Sixteen (16) IDFM Districts
8	35	Table 8-Out of District Placement and Placing Party of Students w ID/MR
9	36	Table 9-All Students versus only In-District Students: Mean & Median TWNDP & Percent Placed in regular class
10	39	Table 10-Districts Identified with significant Disproportionate Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group for MR/ID (N≥20)
11	40	Table 11- Districts Identified with significant Disproportionate Representation of Males as MR/ID
12	49	Table 12-Extracurricular Participation among Connecticut's 13-16 year old students w/ID/MR
13	54	Table 13-Program Review 2002-03

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Table	Page of Annual Report	Title of Table
14	60	Table 14-Fully Adjudicated Impartial Due Process Hearing Results
15	76	Table 15-Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings, including those w/Mediation Requests
16	77	Table 16-Issues of Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings
17	78	Table 17-Districts having requests for Impartial Due Process Hearing
18	78	Table 18-Requests for Mediation
19	79	Table 19-Issues of Mediation
20	80	Table 20-District having requests for Mediation

**DATA INDEX
OF
APPENDICES**

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
A		1998-2003 goal #1 data table Percent of CT K-12 ID/MR Students spending 79-100% of their Time With Non-Disabled Peers
B	55	1998-2003 goal #2 Identification of CT K-12 ID/MR Students by Race/Ethnicity, Prevalence and Gender
C		1998-2003 goal #3 Mean and Median Amount of Time CT K-12 ID/MR Students spend With Non-Disabled Peers
D		2001-2003 goal # 4 Home School Enrollment for CT K-12 ID/MR Students
E		2001-2003 goal #5 Extra Curricular Participation by CT K-12 ID/MR Students
F		1998-2003 Pre- K Data on all five outcomes
G	44	1998-2003 List of Class Members
H		2003-04 Districts are above and below State figures on all LRE outcomes

**OTHER INDEX
OF
APPENDICES
BY
NUMBER**

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
1.	7, 22, 58, 59, 89	District Reviews
2.	8, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 107, 118	<u>A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04</u>
3.	41, 55	Disparate Identification – January 2004 Commissioner's correspondence to District's w/ Disparate Identification
4.	42	Disparate Identification – Summit Invitation 2003-04 for Eighteen Districts
5.	42	Disparate Identification – Summit Invitation 2003-04 for remaining 2002-03 Districts
6.	42	Disparate Identification – Planning Grant
7.	48	Extracurricular Article – <i>Social Activities of Youth w/Disabilities</i>
8.	56	Disparate Identification – February 2004 responses to Commissioner's January 2004 letter
9.	56	Monitoring – List of Districts w/No ID Action Plan Assurances on file w/CSDE
10.	57, 59, 117	Monitoring – IDFM 2003-04 tools for monitoring promising practices, supplementary aids & services, and progress in general curriculum
11.	59	Monitoring – Sample IDFM Monitoring Report

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
12.	64, 68	SERC LRE/Inclusion Booklet
13.	81	Parent – LEA Data Base Mailing
14.	81	Parent – Mailings: 2003-04
15.	82	Parent & CSDE – Organization Meetings
16.	83	Parent – Participation Work Plan
17.	84	Parent – List of Districts receiving CSDE/CPAC provided training
18.	84	Parent – Participation Plan for 2004-05
19.	84	Parent – Specification of Request for Proposal
20.	86, 101	Parent’s Perception of the PJ Settlement Agreement.
21.	112	Commissioner’s May 21, 2004 correspondence to Superintendents on Brown v. BOE
22.	112	Commissioner’s May 21, 2004 correspondence to Superintendents on Brown v. BOE – postponement correspondence.

**OTHER INDEX
OF
APPENDICES
BY
TITLE**

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
2.	8, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 107, 118	A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2003-04
21.	112	Commissioner's May 21, 2004 correspondence to Superintendents on Brown v. BOE
22.	112	Commissioner's May 21, 2004 correspondence to Superintendents on Brown v. BOE – postponement correspondence
8.	56	Disparate Identification – February 2004 responses to Commissioner's January 2004 letter
3.	41, 55	Disparate Identification – January 2004 Commissioner's correspondence to District's w/ Disparate Identification
6.	42	Disparate Identification – Planning Grant
4.	42	Disparate Identification – Summit Invitation 2003-04 for Eighteen Districts
5.	42	Disparate Identification – Summit Invitation 2003-04 for remaining 2002-03 Districts
1.	7, 22, 58, 59, 89	District Reviews
7.	48	Extracurricular Article – <i>Social Activities of Youth w/Disabilities</i>
10.	57, 59, 117	Monitoring – IDFM 2003-04 tools for monitoring promising practices, supplementary aids & services, and progress in general curriculum

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2004
P.J. ET AL v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
9.	56	Monitoring – List of Districts w/No ID Action Plan Assurances on file w/CSDE
11.	59	Monitoring – Sample IDFM Monitoring Report
13.	81	Parent – LEA Data Base Mailing
17.	84	Parent – List of Districts receiving CSDE/CPAC provided training
14.	81	Parent – Mailings: 2003-04
18.	84	Parent – Participation Plan for 2004-05
16.	83	Parent – Participation Work Plan
19.	84	Parent – Specification of Request for Proposal
15.	82	Parent & CSDE – Organization Meetings
20.	86, 101	Parent’s Perception of the PJ Settlement Agreement
12.	64, 68	SERC LRE/Inclusion Booklet