

**Table B - Connecticut Part B
Previously Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 4:</p> <p>OSEP's October 18, 2005 letter responding to Connecticut's FFY 2003 APR reported that Connecticut was not complying with 34 CFR §300.146 because it did not include information indicating that it reviewed, or required affected LEAs to review and, if appropriate, revise policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards, when it identified significant discrepancies in disciplinary suspension rates based on one of the comparisons described in 34 CFR §300.146(a). OSEP required Connecticut to submit the results of the review and any appropriate revisions of policies, procedures and practices required by 34 CFR §300.146(b), with the SPP, or a plan, including strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets and timelines designed to ensure correction of this noncompliance not later than thirty days following one year from the date that OSEP accepted the plan. OSEP also required the State to submit a progress report by April 18, 2006.</p>	<p>On page 13 of the SPP, CSDE described its calculation and process for identifying discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions and determined that 41 districts (24.3%) had a significant discrepancy in disciplinary suspensions. CSDE reported that, when a district is identified as having discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions, the State would require the LEA to review and revise policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards, and report the results to CSDE. The State included improvement strategies, timelines and resources in its SPP designed to ensure correction of this noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State submitted a plan that addresses the information requested.</p>	<p>The State must provide a Progress Report by April 18, 2006.</p> <p>The State must submit the results of the review and any appropriate revisions of policies, procedures, and practices in accordance with 34 CFR §300.146(b), in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 15: <u>Correction of Identified Noncompliance related to Disproportionality.</u></p> <p>OSEP's October 18, 2005 letter required Connecticut to report, with the SPP, the results of its reviews and, if appropriate, revisions of the policies, procedures and practices used in the identification and placement of students with disabilities to ensure that they are consistent with Part B and race-neutral, for those districts with data that illustrate significant disproportionality in the identification of children in specific disability categories and the placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings, as required by 34 CFR §300.755(b), or submit a plan to report on the results of its review of policies, procedures and practices, and to ensure correction of the noncompliance as soon as possible, not to exceed one year from the date that OSEP accepted the plan.</p>	<p>On pages 51-54 and on pages 67-69 of the SPP, CSDE provided its plan and process for determining compliance related to significant disproportionality and to report in the February 2007 APR, the baseline data obtained from this process. In instances where CSDE identifies a district as having significant disproportionality in the identification of children with disabilities in particular disability categories, CSDE reported, on page 54 of the SPP, that it examines special education eligibility policies, procedures and practices, including conducting focused monitoring visits, to ensure that they are race-neutral, as well as reviewing professional development activities, curriculum and instructional practices and early intervening services, including academic and behavioral interventions.</p>	<p>CSDE provided its plan to address policies, procedures and practices when it determines that there is significant disproportionality in the identification of children in particular disability categories. CSDE did not provide all information required by 34 CFR §300.755(b) regarding review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices regarding placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings when a determination of significant disproportionality is made.</p>	<p>In the APR, due February 1, 2007, CSDE must report on the results of its review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.755(b). Failure to include this information at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 16:</p> <p>OSEP's October 18, 2004 letter required Connecticut to submit data in the SPP, demonstrating progress toward compliance with the complaint timeline requirements at 34 CFR §300.661, with a final report to OSEP, demonstrating full compliance, no later than January 14, 2006.</p>	<p>On pages 82-83 of the SPP, CSDE described its process for resolving complaints. CSDE reported a 100% level of compliance with this requirement. On page 82 of the SPP, CSDE also reported that the 60-day time limit for complaint resolution may be extended if the parties agree to</p>	<p>The State's baseline data for FFY 2004 reflect full compliance with the timeline requirements at 34 CFR §300.661. However, mediation is not an exceptional circumstance that would justify extension of the 60-day timeline for complaint resolution, unless the parties agree to the extension</p>	<p>The State must include information in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate that its data reflect full compliance with 34 CFR §300.661, consistent with OSEP's analysis.</p>

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 17:</p> <p>OSEP's October 18, 2005 letter required Connecticut to submit data and analysis in the SPP, demonstrating progress toward compliance with the due process hearing timeliness at 34 CFR §300.511(a) and (c), with a report to OSEP, demonstrating full compliance, no later than January 14, 2006.</p>	<p>engage in mediation or alternative means of dispute resolution. On page 91 of the SPP, the State's data also indicate that of 76 complaint decisions issued, 56 reports contained findings.</p> <p>On pages 84-86 of the SPP, CSDE described its process for issuing timely due process hearing decisions. CSDE reported that 93% of hearing requests were fully adjudicated within required timeliness and that the 7% of due process hearings not completed in a timely manner, represent two hearings.</p>	<p>The State reported a 93% level of compliance for indicator 17 in the SPP, specifically the requirement at 34 CFR §300.511(a) and (c). While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement</p>