

**Table A - Connecticut Part B
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Noncompliance:</u> On page 58 of the SPP, the State reported an 85.4% level of compliance for indicator 12, specifically the requirement at 34 CFR §300.132(b) that children transitioning from Part C and found eligible for services under Part B have an individualized education program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays. The State included activities, with timelines and resources to achieve compliance in this area.</p> <p><u>Other:</u> On page 58 of the SPP, Connecticut reported that its data definition for this indicator reflected a stringent definition of the free appropriate public education (FAPE) provisions, and that its data collection system does not account for variables such as situations where the child's third birthday falls on other than a regular school day (e.g., holidays, weekends, etc.), or where parents choose to delay the provision of FAPE. As a result, Connecticut indicated that its data collection system may under-represent the actual numbers of children who received a FAPE by their third birthday.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected by the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007. The State also must provide the required data for this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR. Failure to demonstrate compliance and to provide the required data at that time may affect the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>In a letter dated September 13, 2005, the Connecticut Department of Education (CSDE) requested flexibility in collecting, measuring and reporting data on this indicator. Specifically, the State requested permission to continue to conduct post-school outcome surveys on a biennial basis, rather than annually as required by the SPP instructions, and to collect data on students with disabilities two years after exiting school rather than one year after exiting school, as required by the SPP instructions.</p>	<p>The State must revise its data collection system to ensure that (2) and (3) in the column 2 are addressed in its post-school outcome data collection and reporting for the SPP. In addition, the State must ensure that "competitively employed" and "enrolled in some type of postsecondary school" are operationally defined when it collects and reports baseline data and sets targets for the</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>States' post-school outcomes data collection must include the following: (1) data on all exiters, including dropouts; (2) data that will allow the State to report annually to the Department and the public on the State's performance; and (3) data that will allow the State to report annually to the public on the performance of each LEA on the indicator. OSEP has determined that the State's proposed post-school outcome data collection is consistent with (1) above.</p>	<p>FFY 2006 APR, due February 2008. This is critical in ensuring that consistent data are collected from one year to the next.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Noncompliance:</u> On page 69 of the SPP, the State reported a 95% level of compliance for indicator 15, specifically the requirements at 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §300.600 that noncompliance identified through monitoring is corrected within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed one year from identification. While this level of compliance is below 100%, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with these requirements.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with these requirements.</p>