

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 79.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77.2%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 72%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 2.8%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 38.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 40%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.6% for reading and 98.4% for math on the CMT, and 91.5% for reading and 90.7% for math on the CAPT. The State's FFY 2006 data for this indicator are 98.5% for reading and 98.9% for math on the CMT, and 91.9% for reading and 93.9% for math on the CAPT. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 93.9% for math on the CAPT. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 97% for reading and math for the CMT,</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>but did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 97% for reading and math on the CAPT.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 30.4% for reading and 42.5% for math on the CMT and 41.4% for reading and 37.2% for math on the CAPT. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 28.8% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 40.8% for math on the CMT and represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 32.2% for math and slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 45.9% for reading on the CAPT. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.2%. The State did not have valid and reliable data for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. However, the State calculated data for this indicator for FFY 2006 and reported it in the FFY 2007 APR. The FFY 2007 data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 21.9%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 25%. OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009: (1) a demonstration that any noncompliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005. The State reported that it did not identify noncompliance with respect to the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005 until 2007-2008. Verification of correction of noncompliance is still within the one year timeline; (2) valid and reliable data for FFY 2006, including a description of the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2007-2008 for six LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005 was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. The State's failure to conduct the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for 21 districts identified based on FFY 2006 data</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for any LEAs identified for FFY 2006 as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year, and whether any noncompliance identified with 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected. For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 data whose policies and procedures were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and that were also identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; and whether practices in these areas continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State provided valid and reliable data for FFY 2006. The State identified 37 districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year based on data for FFY 2006. The State reported that it conducted the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for 16 of the 37 districts, but did not report whether the State identified any noncompliance with the IDEA a result of this review. The State reported that it would complete the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the remaining 21 districts identified with significant discrepancies during FFY 2008; and</p> <p>(3) the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). The State provided this information.</p>	<p>as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year constitutes noncompliance. With respect to these 21 districts, the State must report in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, whether the State conducted the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA.</p> <p>In addition, as noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>The State must also describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006 and 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State must also report, for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data, whether the State identified any noncompliance with the IDEA, and if so,</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		whether the noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.																				
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 967 1467 1445"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>68.3</td> <td>70.2</td> <td>67.5</td> <td>1.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>8</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>6.9</td> <td>6.8</td> <td>5.6</td> <td>0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	68.3	70.2	67.5	1.90%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.2	6.2	8	0.00%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	6.9	6.8	5.6	0.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	68.3	70.2	67.5	1.90%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.2	6.2	8	0.00%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	6.9	6.8	5.6	0.10%																		

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and remain unchanged for 5B from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>																					
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 914 1419 1461"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 914 1062 1089">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 914 1180 1089">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 914 1297 1089">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 914 1419 1089">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1089 1062 1157">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1089 1180 1157">4.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1089 1297 1157">1.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1089 1419 1157">1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1157 1062 1292">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1157 1180 1292">23.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1157 1297 1292">26.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1157 1419 1292">37.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1292 1062 1393">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1292 1180 1393">16.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1292 1297 1393">33.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1292 1419 1393">29.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1393 1062 1461">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1393 1180 1461">20.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1393 1297 1461">17.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1393 1419 1461">16.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4.4	1.9	1.9	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	23.4	26.5	37.3	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	16.3	33.8	29.6	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	20.0	17.6	16.1	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																			
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4.4	1.9	1.9																			
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	23.4	26.5	37.3																			
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	16.3	33.8	29.6																			
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	20.0	17.6	16.1																			

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to same-aged peers.				
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	35.9	20.2	15.0	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.90%	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 87.1%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.4%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to</p>				<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that:</p> <p>(1) the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected. The State provided the required information;</p> <p>(2) the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311; and a review of the district's practices for compliance with these requirements. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that one of three LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For the uncorrected noncompliance for one district, the State reported that it redirected IDEA funds, conducted focused monitoring visits, and arranged for an outside entity to conduct an intensive special education program and services review. As a result of this review, the State directed the district to create a plan of implementation to address the report's findings and will continue to monitor and provide oversight of improvement planning. For the uncorrected noncompliance in the other district, the State reported that it redirected IDEA funds and will receive a report on the district's educational policies, procedures and practices for all students in February 2009. The State will review the findings of that report to determine continued monitoring and supervision of the district.</p>	<p>FFY 2006 and FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP's Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
11. Percent of children with	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP	The State reported that it made no findings

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator during the 2007-2008 year and will produce formal notifications of noncompliance in January 2009.</p>	<p>of noncompliance in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in CFR §300.301(c)(1), and would make findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2006 data in January 2009.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance under this indicator identified based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in early childhood transition, including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that five of six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it continues to work with the one LEA to address the transition needs of its students.</p>	<p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that the LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed the</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 85.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 81.1%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 81.5%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.8%. The State's FFY 2006 data were 97.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information:</p> <p>(1) that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005. The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported a variety of mechanisms, including redirecting the use of IDEA funds to retain an external consulting group to audit each student's IEP and assist the district in developing an accountability plan. The State reported that a District Improvement Plan was developed in the fall of 2008 and the State will continue to intensely monitor this district; and</p> <p>(2) regarding the State's identification and correction of noncompliance for Indicators 4, 10, 11, 12, and 13. The State responded to each indicator as required.</p> <p>The State reported that 90 of 93 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR. In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it conducted monitoring activities and provided school districts with targeted technical assistance and guidance.</p>	<p>LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that two of nine resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 70.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 59.6%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 69%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 92.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Rubric.</p>