

**FOURTH
ANNUAL REPORT**

JUNE 30, 2005

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**

Synopsis
Of Data Outcomes and Anticipated Actions

The following is a summary of the CSDE's progress in addressing the goals of the Settlement Agreement. This **Synopsis** is based on two of the EAP's recommendation at the May 2005 EAP meeting identified below.

Summary

1. Continuous statewide improvement has occurred on all goals of the Settlement Agreement with meaningful improvement on goal #1.
2. Increase in all of the LRE goals of the Settlement Agreement
 - Goal 1- Regular Class Placement 20.1%
 - Goal 3- Mean 51.9% and Median 52.8%
 - Goal 4-Home School 77.1%
 - Goal 5- Extracurricular Participation 33.2%
3. Decrease in statewide disparate identification rate in all overrepresented groups (Black, Hispanic, American Indian and Male)
 - Goal 2- Disparate Identification-
 - Male ID 53% compared to 51.5% State
 - Proportion of American Indian ID comparable to proportion American Indian students in the State
 - Difference in proportion of Black ID students and Black students in the State reduced from 12.8% to 10.1%
 - Difference in proportion of Hispanic ID students and Hispanic students in the state reduced from 7% to 6.5%
4. Eleven (11) of the twenty-four (24) ID focused monitoring districts have already achieved or exceeded the EAP target of 40% regular class placement six (6) months ahead of EAP target date (December 2005) and one (1) has already exceeded the EAP December 2007 target. The remaining districts all exceed the December 2004 state average of 20.1%
5. Eight (8) of the twenty-four (24) ID focused monitoring districts have already achieved or exceeded the EAP target of 90% home school six (6) months ahead of EAP target date (December 2005) and an additional ten (10) are between 81% to 89% home school placement. Twenty (20) districts exceed the December 2004 state average of 77.1%

EAP Recommendations

1. The conversation concerning state and LEA progress towards the goals of the P.J. Settlement Agreement should be framed, in part, by reporting the status of all LEAs (including the target 24 LEAs) using June 15, 2005 data (for 24 LEAs) or 12/1/04 data (for all other LEAs) within the following ranking (*CSDE made slight changes to these groupings as the EAP's criteria did not encompass some numbers*):

Table 1- EAP Recommended Groupings

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4
Goal 1-Regular Class	<24%	≥24% to <40%	≥ 40 %to <80%	≥80%
Goal 4-Home School	<75%	≥75 to <81%	≥81% to <90%	≥90%
Goal 2-Disparate Identification	Propose a meaningful 3 category scheme			Non-Significant

2. Change the report format for the Annual Report to include an introductory section that uses the categorization described in #1 above and describe the proposed interventions for LEAs in each ‘Phase.’ We realize that there will be different interventions for different LEAs or types of LEAs.

Below are the recommended charts and anticipated interventions for each group.

Regular Class Placement and Home School

Table 2- All Connecticut Districts Grouped by EAP Suggested Cutpoints for Percent Placed in Regular Class

(Districts in bold are from the 24 IDFM districts and are categorized based on June 2005 data; all other districts are categorized based on December 2004 data)

Group 1 <24%			Group 2 ≥24% to <40%	Group 3 ≥40% to <80%	Group 4 ≥80%
Andover	Middletown	Regional #4	Bloomfield	Ansonia	Corrections
Ashford	Naugatuck	Regional #5	Branford	Bridgeport	Canterbury
Avon	New Britain	Regional #6	Colchester	Bristol	Deep River
Berlin	New Canaan	Regional #7	Coventry	DCF	Hebron
Bethel	New Fairfield	Regional #8	East Hampton	Derby	Sprague
Bolton	New Milford	Ridgefield	East Hartford	East Haven	VT Schools
Brookfield	Newington	Rocky Hill	Ellington	Eastford	Windham
Brooklyn	North Branford	Simsbury	Enfield	Granby	
Canton	North Canaan	South Windsor	Greenwich	Guilford	
Cheshire	North Haven	Southington	Hamden	Hartford	
Clinton	North Stonington	Sterling	Hartland	Mansfield	

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Group 1 <24%			Group 2 ≥24% to <40%	Group 3 ≥40% to <80%	Group 4 ≥80%
Colebrook	Norwalk	Stonington	Lisbon	Meriden	
Columbia	Oxford	Stratford	Madison	New Haven	
Cromwell	Plainville	Thomaston	Manchester	Newtown	
Danbury	Plymouth	Tolland	Marlborough	Regional #9	
Darien	Pomfret	Torrington	Milford	Salem	
East Granby	Portland	Vernon	Monroe	Seymour	
E. Haddam	Preston	Voluntown	Montville	Shelton	
East Lyme	Putnam	Waterbury	New London	Somers	
E. Windsor	Redding	Waterford	Norwich	Stafford	
Easton	Regional #1	Watertown	Old Saybrook	Suffield	
Fairfield	Regional #10	West Hartford	Plainfield	Trumbull	
Farmington	Regional #11	Weston	Regional #17	Wallingford	
Glastonbury	Regional #12	Westport	Stamford	Windsor	
Griswold	Regional #13	Wethersfield	Thompson		
Groton	Regional #14	Winchester	West Haven		
Killingly	Regional #15	Windsor Locks	Westbrook		
Lebanon	Regional #16	Wolcott	Wilton		
Ledyard	Regional #18	Woodbridge			
Litchfield	Regional #19	Woodstock			

**Table 3-All Connecticut Districts Grouped
by EAP Suggested Cutpoints for Percent Attending Home School**
(Districts in bold are from the 24 IDFM districts and are categorized based on June 2005 data;
all other districts are categorized based on December 2004 data)

Group 1 <75%	Group 2 ≥75% to < 81%	Group 3 ≥ 81% to < 90%	Group 4 ≥ 90%	
Bridgeport	Bethel	Ansonia	Montville	Norwich
Canton	Bloomfield	Branford	Andover	Oxford
Cromwell	Ellington	Bristol	Ashford	Plainfield
Darien	Farmington	Brooklyn	Avon	Pomfret
DCF	Groton	Cheshire	Berlin	Preston
Derby	Middletown	Clinton	Bolton	Redding
East Haddam	Monroe	Coventry	Brookfield	Regional #1
East Haven	New Fairfield	Danbury	Canterbury	Regional #10
Glastonbury	Newington	East Hampton	Colchester	Regional #12
Granby	Norwalk	East Hartford	Colebrook	Regional #13
Guilford	Regional #18	East Windsor	Columbia	Regional #15
Hamden	Simsbury	Enfield	Corrections	Regional #17
Ledyard	Tolland	Fairfield	Deep River	Regional #19
Litchfield	Vernon	Griswold	East Granby	Regional #7
New Britain		Manchester	East Lyme	Regional #8
North Branford		Milford	Eastford	Salem
North Haven		Naugatuck	Easton	Shelton

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Group 1 <75%	Group 2 ≥75% to < 81%	Group 3 ≥ 81% to < 90%	Group 4 ≥ 90%	
Old Saybrook		New Milford	Greenwich	Sprague
Plainville		Newtown	Hartford	Sterling
Plymouth		North Stonington	Hartland	Thomaston
Putnam		Portland	Hebron	Voluntown
Regional #11		Ridgefield	Killingly	VT Schools
Regional #14		Seymour	Lebanon	Watertown
Regional #16		Stafford	Lisbon	West Hartford
Regional #4		Suffield	Madison	Wilton
Regional #5		Torrington	Mansfield	Winchester
Regional #6		Wallingford	Marlborough	Windham
Regional #9		Waterbury	Meriden	Windsor
Rocky Hill		West Haven	New Canaan	Wolcott
Somers			New Haven	Woodbridge
South Windsor			New London	Woodstock
Southington			North Canaan	
Stamford				
Stonington				
Stratford				
Thompson				
Trumbull				
Waterford				
Westbrook				
Weston				
Westport				
Wethersfield				
Windsor Locks				

Proposed Interventions for 2005-06

The interventions that will be conducted during 2005-06 will be determined in July 2005 following the summative evaluation process of the twenty-four districts.

Several interventions that will be considered for the twenty-four (24) IDFM districts and other select districts from Groups 1 and 2 include:

- Meeting between Commissioner/Associate Commissioner and Superintendent/Board Chair
- Letter to Board Chair
- Review of progress on the district improvement plan on a quarterly basis. All district's data to be publicly displayed on the CSDE's website
- Redesign improvement plan with more direction from the CSDE
- Presentation of improvement plan to the local board of education. Local board may be required to hold a public hearing to present the improvement plan.
- Release of IDEA funds on a conditional basis or direct IDEAIA funds to address strategies in the improvement plan.

- Appoint a special education consultant to assist with implementation of the improvement plan at district expense
- March and June data collection
- Mid year and end of year reports
- Monitoring for compliance with IEP development and placement decisions
- Data auditing for accuracy
- On-site technical assistance from CSDE and/or SERC specific to issues identified in summative evaluations and lessons learned from previous years

Several interventions that will be considered for the twenty-four (24) IDFM districts and select other districts from Groups 3 and 4 include:

- Letter of commendation/acknowledgement to superintendent and/or local board of education from the commissioner or associate commissioner of education
- Commendation on the CSDE’s website
- Identification as a spotlight district
- Allocation of sliver grant funds for replication of commended strategies
- March and June data collection
- Mid year and end of year reports
- Monitoring for compliance with IEP development and placement decisions
- Data auditing for accuracy

Disparate Identification

**Table 4- Districts with Overrepresentation by Race/Ethnicity of
2003-04 Data that is Statistically Significant and/or has High Odds Ratios
Grouped by CSDE Cutpoints**

YEAR OF DATA	Group 1 Statistically significant overrepresentation and odds ratio ≥ 2.00	Group 2 Statistically significant overrepresentation, but no odds ratio ≥ 2.00	Group 3 Odds ratio ≥ 2.00 but no statistically significant overrepresentation	Group 4 No statistically significant overrepresentation and no odds ratio ≥ 2.00 and have been in group 1-3, previously
2003-04	Stamford East Hartford Manchester Norwalk Windham	New Britain New Haven	Groton	Stratford Windsor

Proposed Interventions for 2005-06 (based on 2003-04 data)

Group 1

- Manchester, Norwalk and Windham were focused monitored in 2004-05 on overrepresentation and are required to complete corrective actions by the spring 2006 and will be submitting improvement plans to the CSDE by July 2005. These plans will be monitored by CSDE for implementation through December 2006.
- Norwalk and Windham will be directed to use 15% of their federal IDEIA funds for early intervening services.
- Stamford has been identified for focused monitoring for ID and other overrepresented groups during 2005-06. This focused monitoring includes site visits, file review, observation and an interview process within the district with a team of CSDE consultants and other members. This monitoring is the statewide focused monitoring system described in Appendix 6.
- East Hartford was cited for noncompliance during 2004-05 respect to identification practices and is required to take corrective action by June 2006. Additionally, the CSDE has worked with East Hartford to develop an improvement plan to address instructional issues that also impact overrepresentation. This plan will be monitored through December 2006.
- All districts in this group are participating in *Courageous Conversations on Race*
- All districts in this group will be invited to participate in future Summit activities on Closing the Achievement Gap, the state's initiative to address overrepresentation.

Group 2

- New Britain has been identified for focused monitoring for ID and other overrepresented groups during 2005-06. This focused monitoring includes site visits, file review, observation and an interview process within the district with a team of CSDE consultants and other members. This monitoring is the statewide focused monitoring system described in Appendix 6.
- New Haven interventions will be discussed during summer 2005 to determine next steps
- All districts in this group are participating in *Courageous Conversations on Race*
- All districts in this group will be invited to participate in future Summit activities on Closing the Achievement Gap, the state's initiative to address overrepresentation.

Group 3 and Group 4

- All districts in this group will be invited to participate in future Summit activities on Closing the Achievement Gap, the state's initiative to address overrepresentation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
INTRODUCTION.....	1
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT.....	3
CLASS MEMBERSHIP.....	4
STATEWIDE DATA REVIEW.....	10
DISTRICT DATA REVIEW-TWNDP, HOME SCHOOL & EXTRACURRICULAR..	10
Districts with 20 or more students with an intellectual disability.....	10
Districts with 19 or fewer students an intellectual disability	15
ID Focused Monitoring Districts	16
IDFM 8 Districts.....	16
IDFM 16 Districts.....	21
EXTRACURRICULAR PARTICIPATION.....	31
OUT-OF-DISTRICT PLACEMENTS.....	34
DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION.....	38
DATA ACCURACY.....	49
MONITORING ACTIVITIES.....	56
TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM.....	78
QUALIFIED SPECIALISTS.....	86
COACHES ACADEMY.....	91
IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM.....	93
COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS.....	94

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION.....	99
EXPERT ADVISORY PANEL.....	108
EAP Report- September 30, 2004 Recommendations.....	109
October 2004 Meeting Recommendations.....	114
January 2005 Meeting Recommendations.....	116
May 2005 Meeting Recommendations.....	117
HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS.....	119
LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP.....	123
PROGRAM EVALUATION.....	126
ACTIVITIES: 2005-06.....	129
INDEX OF TABLES.....	137
INDEX OF DAT APPENDICES.....	140
INDEX OF OTHER APPENDICES BY NUMBER.....	141
INDEX OF OTHER APPENDICES BY TITLE-ALPHABETICAL.....	145

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

	Abbreviation	Explanation
1.	ACES	Area Cooperative Educational Services- one of 6 RESCs in the state
2.	AFCAMP	African Caribbean American Families of 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.	IDEIA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act- federal special education law reauthorized in 2004
16.	IDFM	24 districts selected for focused monitoring in the area of intellectual disability
17.	IEC	Intensive Education Centers-term used in Enfield Public Schools for self-contained classes
18.	IEP	Individualized Education Program
19.	LEA	Local Education Agency
20.	LICC	Local Interagency Coordinating Council

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

21.	LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
22.	MR	Mental Retardation
23.	NCCRESt	National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems
24.	NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
25.	NA	Not Available
26.	PCI	Personal Computer Information- name of data collection system used to collect December 1 special education data in Connecticut
27.	PPT	Planning and Placement Team-state term that is comparable to federal term- IEP team
28.	PSIS	Public School Information System- name of data collection system use to collect October 2 all student data in Connecticut
29.	Reg. Class	Regular class- defined as greater than 79% time with non-disabled peers
30.	RESC	Regional Education Service Center
31.	RESC Alliance	Collaborative arrangement of the 6 RESCs for joint cooperative projects
32.	SBPP	School Based Practices Profile
33.	SERC	Special Education Resource Center
34.	SIG	State Improvement Grant-federal funding to state's for supporting implementation of IDEA, newly referred to as State Personnel Development Grant
35.	TWNDP	Time with nondisabled peers
36.	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, 2005**, henceforth referred to as the Fourth Annual Report- June 2005, is the fourth and last report to be 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 **Fourth Annual Report-June 2005**, 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 2004-05 year, the CSDE has conducted a multiplicity of activities to implement the Settlement 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. 4); Program Compliance Review (MONITORING, pg 56 and Appendix 3); Technical Assistance (TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, pg. 78 and Appendix 1 - A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development: 2004-05); Parent Involvement (PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION, pg. 99); the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) (pg. 108); and Complaint Resolution Process (COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND DUE PROCESS HEARING, pg. 94).

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; data accuracy; qualified specialists; coaches academy; immediate response team; locus of leadership; program evaluation; high school and young adults and activities 2005-06. Each of these areas contributes to the CSDE's implementation of the Settlement Agreement.

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 from December 1, 1999 through December 1, 2002 was provided in the **Second Annual Report -Appendix G**; a list representing the December 1, 2003 reporting cycle was included in the **Third Annual Report -Appendix G**. For this report, a continuation of this year a list representing the December 1, 2004 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.

A discussion of the issues raised by the plaintiffs and the EAP regarding the decrease in class membership and accuracy of reporting are located in DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 39 and DATA ACCURACY, pg. 49. Monitoring and auditing activities specific to this issue are located in MONITORING, pg. 56.

STATEWIDE DATA REVIEW

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

Goals #1, 3, 4 and 5

Connecticut has demonstrated continuous improvement from the baseline year 1998-99 to 2004-05 in Goal #1- Percent of students with ID/MR placed in regular class increasing from 13.5% to 20.1% (+6.6% over last year); and Goal #3- mean time with nondisabled peers increasing from 43.7% to 51.9% (+8.2% over last year); and median time with non-disabled peers increasing from 42.5% to 52.8% (+10.3% over last year).

Statewide data from 2003-04 to 2004-05 for Goal #4-percent of students with ID/MR educated in their home school shows an increase across three years from 75.5% to 77.1% (+1.6% over last year) and Goal #5-percent of students participating in extracurricular activities an increase from 26.0 to 33.2% (+7.2% over last year).

Table 5-State Goals 1, 3, 4, and 5 from 1998-2004

GOAL		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
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%	13.5%	20.1%
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%	43.7%	51.9%
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%	52.8%
4	Home School Enrollment for CT K-12 ID/MR students	No data	No data	No data	71.3%	71.3%	75.5%	77.1%
5	Extracurricular Participation for CT K-12 ID/MR students	No data	No data	No data	20.3%	20.2%	26.0%	33.2%

Goal #2

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

Incidence

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 continued at 0.6% from 2002-03 to 2004-05. This is a 14.3% drop in incidence since 1998. During that period of time, the overall incidence rate for all students with disabilities decreased 11.9% (from 13.5% to 11.9%)

**Table 6- State Goal 2-CT K-12 Students with ID/MR
Incidence Rate from 1998-2004**

GOAL		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
2	Incidence of CT K-12 ID/MR students	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
2	Count of CT K-12 ID/MR students	4103	3939	3759	3682	3548	3369	3174

A decline in the incidence of ID/MR in the K-12 population between 1998 and 2004 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 13.5% in 1998 to 11.9% in 2004). 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. The CSDE also contends that the decline in incidence must be considered in the context of specific CSDE efforts related to appropriate identification practice. For a discussion of this, see DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 39. 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 in section DATA ACCURACY, pg. 49.

Gender

In the area of gender for the 2004-05 year, the state is statistically significantly disproportionate in its identification of students with ID by gender, with disproportionate representation of males.

Table 7- State Goal 2-Male Gender Rate from 1998-2004
2004-2005 Data are Preliminary

Goal 2	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Male State (K-12)	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	51.5%	51.5%	51.5%
Male ID (K-12)	55.0%	55.6%	55.3%	56.5%	56.8%	56.1%	55.0%

There has been a decrease in the Male ID (K-12) population to 55.0% down from 56.1% and is in closer alignment with the Male State (K-12) population than in previous years. This movement is an indicator of progress on goal #2 of the Settlement Agreement with respect to gender.

Race/ethnicity

The CSDE, in examining overrepresentation, would anticipate that proportion of any race/ethnic group would be similarly represented in the ID population as it is in the state total student population. Therefore, when analyzing the ID race/ethnicity data, the difference between the state proportion of Black and Hispanic students and the proportion of these students within the ID disability group should be decreasing, as these groups are currently overrepresented in the ID population. A comparative review of 2003-04 to 2004-05 data indicate a closing of the rate for Black and Hispanic representation, thus indicating that the state is making improvement in achieving Goal 2 of the Settlement Agreement with respect to race/ethnicity these two overrepresented groups.

Table 8- State Goal 2 Race/Ethnicity Rate from 1998-2004
2004-2005 Data are Preliminary

Goal 2	Race/Ethnicity CT K-12 ID/MR (%)	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
American Indian	State	0.3%	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%	0.3%
Asian American	State	2.6%	2.7%	2.8%	3.0%	3.0%	3.2%	3.4%
	ID	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%	2.0%
Black	State	13.5%	13.5%	13.6%	13.8%	13.5%	13.7%	13.8%
	ID	31.3%	30.4%	29.7%	27.5%	27.7%	26.5%	23.9%
White	State	71.4%	70.9%	70.3%	69.3%	68.6%	67.8%	67.6%
	ID	44.6%	45.9%	46.8%	49.7%	49.1%	49.8%	52.4%
Hispanic	State	12.2%	12.6%	13.0%	13.7%	14.1%	14.5%	14.9%
	ID	22.1%	21.9%	21.5%	20.8%	21.2%	21.5%	21.4%

Table 9- State Goal 2 Race/Ethnicity Difference in Race/Ethnic Proportions
Between State and ID from 1998-2004 for Overrepresented Groups
(2004-2005 Data are Preliminary)

Goal 2	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Black	17.8	16.9	16.1	13.7	14.2	12.8	10.1
Hispanic	9.9	9.3	8.5	7.1	7.1	7.0	6.5

Odds ratios, which compare the rate of representation among students of a particular racial/ethnic group within a disability category to the rate among their white peers, has decreased for Black and Hispanic students over two years of data for which this calculation is available. In the 2002-03 data, Blacks were 2.84 times as likely to be identified as ID as compared to their white peers; Hispanics were 2.1 times as likely to be

identified as compares to their white counterparts in that same year of data. Analysis of the 2003-04 data reveals that the odds ratios had decreased for both groups to 2.64 for Black students and 2.0 for Hispanic students (see Appendix 2).

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 has seen no net increase 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.

**DISTRICT DATA REVIEW-
TIME WITH NONDISABLED PEER, HOME SCHOOL AND
EXTRACURRICULAR PARTICIPATION**

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 2003 data collection. There are an additional nineteen (19) districts, added to twenty-three (23) of the twenty-four (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. One of the originally selected twenty-four (24) districts (Shelton) has dropped 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.

**Table 10- 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%	20.0%	13.5%
04 Reg. Class***	27.3%	4.0%	25.0%	0.0%	7.4%	25.0%	20.1%
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%	50.0% ⁰	54.3%	39.9%	46.8%	43.7%
04 TWNDP mean***	41.3%	51.7%	48.3%	53.6%	53.0%	47.0%	51.9%
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%	44.0%	59.4%	41.8%	45.6%	42.5%
04 TWNDP median***	27.7%	58.5%	46.1%	64.7%	53.8%	49.0%	52.8%
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%	84.0%	75.5
04 Home School***	81.8%	88.0%	91.7%	84.2%	81.5%	91.7%	77.1%
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%
03 Extracurr**	42.9%	23.1%	19.0%	50.0%	21.7%	56.0%	25.9%
04 Extracurr***	31.8%	28.0%	29.2%	42.1%	25.9%	45.8%	33.2%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
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	25	3,369
04 Count	22	25	24	19	27	24	3,174

	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%	13.5 %
04 Reg. Class***	17.0%	10.9%	11.4%	23.1%	23.1%	25.0%	20.1 %
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%	43.7 %
04 TWNDP mean***	53.2%	42.2%	44.8%	49.8%	63.8%	62.1%	51.9 %
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 %
04 TWNDP mean***	53.0%	37.7%	38.5%	55.1%	64.1%	58.8%	52.8 %
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%	94.6%	75.5 %
04 Home School***	76.6%	80.4%	88.6%	80.8%	88.5%	94.4%	77.1 %

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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 Extracurr	0.0%	19.6%	16.7%	30.4%	0.0%	12.9%	20.3%
02 Extracurr	2.5%	20.0%	16.3%	28.6%	0.0%	14.7%	20.2%
03 Extracurr**	50.0%	39.6%	22.0%	28.0%	8.0%	16.2%	25.9%
04 Extracurr***	51.1%	41.3%	11.4%	19.2%	23.1%	16.7%	33.2%
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	3,369
04 Count	47	46	35	26	26	36	3,174

	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%	13.5%
04 Reg. Class***	11.1%	20.8%	19.4%	13.9%	75.9%	8.6%	3.0%	20.1%
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%	40.9%	54.3%	51.2%	43.7%
04 TWNDP mean***	34.7%	47.3%	42.1%	56.2%	83.0%	53.4%	44.0%	51.9%
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%
03 TWNDP median**	51.1%	51.6%	36.7%	48.6%	40.6%	56.9%	50.0%	42.5%
04 TWNDP median***	31.8%	52.3%	33.3%	62.6%	100.0%	56.9%	43.3%	52.8%
01 Home	65.4%	87.0%	91.5%	90.3%	100.0%	71.4%	66.7%	71.3%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
School								
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%	80.0%	89.5%	76.7%	75.5%
04 Home School***	66.7%	66.7%	71.0%	88.9%	69.0%	80.0%	90.9%	77.1%
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%	24.0%	81.6%	50.0%	25.9%
04 Extracurr***	33.3%	37.5%	41.9%	88.9%	100.0%	91.4%	39.4%	33.2%
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	3,369
04 Count	18	24	31	36	29	35	33	3,174

The data presented above for the nineteen districts were analyzed in order to determine these districts' progress in relation to the state averages for December 2004.

For goal #1: regular class placement

- Eight (8) districts are above the state
- Eleven (11) districts are below.

For goal #3: mean-TWNDP

- Eight (8) districts are above the state
- Eleven (11) districts are below.

For goal #3: median-TWND

- Eleven (11) districts are above the state
- Eight (8) districts are below.

For goal #4: home school enrollment

- Fourteen (14) districts are above the state
- Five (5) districts are below.

For goal # 5: **extracurricular**

- Eleven (11) districts are above the state
- Eight (8) districts are below.

The data indicates that there are three districts (Groton, Southington and Stratford) that are below the 2004 state figures in both regular class placement and home school.

District with 19 or Fewer Students with an Intellectual Disability

One hundred and three (103) 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-four (34) districts have 10-19 students with an intellectual disability and sixty-nine (69) 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 for further detail about these districts.

Data was examined for regular class placement, mean TWNDP and home school. Of the thirty-four (34) districts with 10-19 students with an intellectual disability:

Regular Class placement: 12 are above the state figure,

Mean TWNDP: 16 are above the state figure, and

Home School: 20 are above the state figure.

Of the Sixty-nine (69) districts with less than 10 students with an intellectual disability:

Regular Class placement: 24 are above the state figure,

Mean TWNDP: 36 are above the state figure, and

Home School: 51 are above the state figure.

ID Focused Monitoring Districts

Following is an overview of the progress of districts identified for focused monitoring during the 2004-05 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 and self-assessments for each of the twenty-four districts targeted during 2004-05 for ID focused monitoring are located in Appendix 3.

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 11- 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 2004-05 school year.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Table 11- 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%
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.	14.2%	11.3%	8.8%	20.5%	50.0%	5.5%	20.4%	12.1%	13.5%
Mar. 04 Reg. Class.	11.2%	11.5%	5.7%	22.3%	50.0%	5.9%	17.3%	12.9%	NA
Jun. 04 Reg. Class.	9.7%	18.4%	12.5%	18.4%	56.3%	8.2%	15.8%	13.8%	NA
Dec. 04 Reg. Class.	12.8%	17.6%	18.2%	20.0%	52.9%	15.0%	22.2%	21.9%	20.1%
Mar. 05 Reg. Class.	13.2%	22.2%	16.7%	20.5%	56.3%	14.7%	27.5%	23.5%	NA
Jun. 05 Reg. Class.	46.4%	27.7%	36.0%	45.3%	57.1%	21.2%	31.6%	90.3%	
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	25.7%	21.3%	17.4%	33.4%	28.5%	19.9%	21.1%	29.6%	34.3%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
TWNDP Mean									
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	45.2%	52.9%	47.2%	45.8%	65.1%	28.4%	38.5%	40.4%	43.6%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Mean	43.8%	53.3%	49.0%	45.7%	65.7%	29.4%	36.6%	43.5%	NA
Jun. 04 TWNDP Mean	44.2%	57.9%	54.1%	51.2%	70.8%	34.7%	39.4%	46.3%	NA
Dec. 04 TWNDP Mean	43.3%	58.0%	58.7%	50.7%	68.1%	46.2%	48.8%	49.5%	51.9%
Mar. 05 TWNDP Mean	43.3%	60.6%	58.0%	50.9%	72.3%	46.1%	52.8%	50.4%	NA
Jun. 05 TWNDP Mean	56.3%	62.7%	63.8%	66.7%	70.0%	54.0%	57.7%	77.1%	
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%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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. 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	43.3%	54.4%	49.5%	45.0%	78.7%	22.4%	29.1%	44.8%	NA
Jun. 04 TWNDP Median	48.4%	64.3%	50.7%	46.7%	81.8%	32.4%	36.7%	52.2%	NA
Dec. 04 TWNDP Median	43.4%	64.5%	53.8%	46.7%	80.3%	42.5%	43.1%	53.4%	52.8%
Mar. 05 TWNDP Median	43.3%	66.8%	54.9%	60.5%	80.8%	42.5%	55.6%	53.4%	NA
Jun. 05 TWNDP Median	59.3%	67.1%	60.0%	75.0%	81.4%	55.9%	65.5%	83.6%	
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	49.7%	81.1%	67.6%	91.9%	83.3%	63.5%	55.6%	72.7%	75.5%
Mar. 04 Home School	70.8%	78.8%	65.7%	87.7%	83.3%	68.8%	53.8%	77.4%	NA
Jun. 04 Home School	66.7%	81.6%	78.1%	91.0%	87.5%	68.7%	71.1%	79.3%	NA
Dec. 04 Home	63.1%	84.3%	75.8%	89.4%	88.2%	68.8%	77.8%	84.4%	77.1%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
School									
Mar. 05 Home School	62.5%	83.3%	80.0%	89.2%	93.8%	69.9%	80.0%	79.4%	NA
Jun. 05 Home School	59.5%	89.4%	88.0%	90.0%	92.9%	81.2%	84.2%	90.3%	
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.	13.7%	32.1%	35.3%	34.9%	33.3%	11.6%	13.0%	15.2%	26.0%
Mar. 04 Extracurr.	21.3%	32.7%	34.3%	35.8%	33.3%	15.5%	13.5%	12.9%	NA
Jun. 04 Extracurr.	25.5%	38.8%	31.3%	44.8%	50.0%	19.8%	13.2%	17.2%	NA
Dec. 04 Extracurr.	28.9%	35.3%	30.3%	50.0%	29.4%	27.5%	17.8%	18.8%	33.2%
Mar. 05 Extracurr.	29.6%	40.7%	36.7%	50.0%	31.3%	25.2%	20.0%	14.7%	NA
Jun. 05 Extracurr.	32.0%	42.6%	40.0%	54.7%	35.7%	31.5%	44.7%	45.2%	
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	183	53	34	258	18	181	54	33	3,369
Mar. 04 Count	178	52	35	332	18	187	52	31	NA
Jun. 04 Count	166	49	32	201	16	180	38	29	NA

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
Count									
Dec. 04 Count.	149	51	33	180	17	160	45	32	3,174
Mar. 05 Count.	152	54	30	176	16	163	40	34	NA
Jun. 05 Count.	153	47	25	170	14	165	38	31	NA

All of the eight (8) districts are above the state 2004 figures for regular class placement, mean TWNDP, and median TWNDP. All districts are above 2004 figures for home school and extracurricular participation except for Bridgeport that is below for these two areas and Waterbury that is only below for extracurricular participation.

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 12- 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%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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. 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%	15.1%	18.6%	2.6%	11.8%	17.6%	4.6%	4.6%	13.5%
Mar. 04 Reg. Class.	4.0%	28.1%	15.5%	4.0%	7.9%	17.1%	5.4%	10.0%	NA
Jun. 04 Reg. Class.	13.6%	56.9%	17.9%	13.2%	7.1%	16.1%	5.1%	9.1%	NA
Dec. 04 Reg. Class.	28.6%	62.2%	29.4%	19.2%	7.7%	17.6%	10.4%	10.4%	20.1%
Mar. 05 Reg. Class.	31.6%	55.8%	25.0%	20.4%	11.5%	22.6%	10.6%	13.0%	NA
Jun. 05 Reg. Class.	40.0%	61.2%	23.6%	35.0%	50.0%	29.6%	41.0%	26.3%	
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

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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 Mean	38.9%	56.1%	56.5%	37.2%	39.9%	45.6%	26.6%	38.1%	43.7%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Mean	42.3%	59.7%	51.3%	39.7%	34.7%	46.4%	27.6%	38.2%	NA
Jun. 04 TWNDP Mean	47.4%	71.1%	59.6%	57.3%	35.2%	47.7%	27.1%	37.7%	NA
Dec. 04 TWNDP Mean	53.1%	77.1%	64.2%	59.3%	39.5%	45.4%	38.8%	52.4%	51.9%
Mar. 05 TWNDP Mean	55.2%	76.8%	63.5%	58.2%	40.7%	47.1%	42.5%	52.0%	NA
Jun. 05 TWNDP Mean	61.4%	76.7%	68.4%	69.8%	54.0%	46.8%	64.1%	70.4%	
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
Dec. 03 TWNDP Median	42.4%	55.6%	56.6%	35.9%	45.3%	46.3%	19.8%	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
Jun. 04 TWNDP Median	42.8%	80.5%	60.0%	56.5%	43.5%	45.8%	20.0%	35.6%	NA

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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. 04 TWNDP Median	43.6%	80.6%	66.2%	63.5%	45.3%	44.5%	38.8%	53.8%	52.8%
Mar. 05 TWNDP Median	43.6%	80.6%	65.9%	55.0%	45.3%	44.9%	40.5%	53.8%	NA
Jun. 05 TWNDP Median	57.6%	78.9%	66.2%	68.0%	50.6%	43.7%	76.8%	72.4%	
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	68.0%	73.1%	78.6%	77.9%	58.8%	73.5%	68.8%	68.6%	75.5%
Mar. 04 Home School	72.0%	77.2%	76.2%	80.0%	55.3%	74.3%	68.0%	68.0%	NA
Jun. 04 Home School	68.2%	62.4%	77.6%	77.4%	46.4%	77.4%	64.3%	75.0%	NA
Dec. 04 Home School	71.4%	88.9%	77.6%	81.5%	46.2%	58.8%	58.5%	87.2%	77.1%
Mar. 05 Home School	72.7%	88.4%	76.6%	83.0%	57.7%	61.3%	58.5%	84.8%	NA
Jun. 05 Home School	85.0%	86.0%	81.8%	85.0%	72.7%	63.0%	91.4%	89.5%	
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.	8.0%	20.8%	25.7%	9.1%	5.9%	11.8%	10.4%	23.5%	26.0%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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. 04 Extracurr.	28.0%	19.3%	23.8%	18.7%	7.9%	20.0%	9.2%	24.0%	NA
Jun. 04 Extracurr.	27.3%	19.6%	25.4%	54.7%	21.4%	29.0%	8.1%	31.8%	NA
Dec. 04 Extracurr.	38.1%	17.8%	26.9%	50.0%	34.6%	35.3%	10.4%	25.5%	33.2%
Mar. 05 Extracurr.	40.9%	55.8%	29.7%	44.7%	34.6%	38.7%	9.4%	23.9%	NA
Jun. 05 Extracurr.	40.0%	58.1%	29.1%	57.5%	45.5%	22.2%	16.2%	21.1%	
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
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	53	70	77	34	34	240	51	3,369
Mar. 04 Count	25	57	84	75	38	35	294	50	NA
Jun. 04 Count	23	51	64	53	28	31	235	44	NA
Dec. 04 Count	21	45	67	54	26	34	260	47	3,174
Mar. 05 Count	22	43	64	47	26	31	265	46	NA
Jun. 05 Count	21	43	55	40	22	27	266	38	

	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.	6.3%	7.1%	0.0%	11.0%	4.4%	5.9%	21.2%	0.0%	11.1%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
Class.									
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%	19.5%	15.5%	30.4%	5.6%	5.6%	11.4%	13.5%
Mar. 04 Reg. Class.	10.2%	3.1%	20.5%	12.0%	33.3%	17.1%	5.9%	10.8%	NA
June 04 Reg. Class.	24.1%	2.9%	10.0%	12.7%	39.7%	12.1%	3.1%	21.4%	NA
Dec. 04 Reg. Class.	32.9%	18.6%	17.1%	12.2%	37.7%	15.2%	10.0%	25.0%	20.1%
Mar. 05 Reg. Class.	42.9%	20.9%	21.6%	13.6%	37.7%	15.2%	9.7%	20.8%	NA
June 05 Reg. Class.	53.9%	20.6%	26.7%	23.2%	39.3%	25.0%	63.0%	76.2%	
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 Mean	35.2%	19.0%	34.9%	30.6%	32.3%	28.8%	21.8%	39.2%	34.3%
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

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
Dec. 03 TWNDP Mean	40.7%	43.0%	51.3%	37.6%	55.9%	30.8%	31.5%	50.1%	43.7%
Mar. 04 TWNDP Mean	45.8%	42.6%	56.4%	33.2%	58.4%	39.7%	33.4%	46.8%	NA
Jun. 04 TWNDP Mean	61.3%	51.1%	54.8%	48.1%	64.8%	39.1%	31.8%	52.8%	NA
Dec. 04 TWNDP Mean	65.6%	57.4%	55.8%	47.8%	61.8%	49.3%	54.9%	58.3%	51.9%
Mar. 05 TWNDP Mean	69.6%	59.5%	55.8%	48.5%	59.8%	61.8%	55.5%	56.9%	NA
Jun. 05 TWNDP Mean	72.7%	59.5%	64.3%	64.1%	63.2%	63.2%	68.5%	78.9%	
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%	24.8%	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
Jun. 04 TWNDP Median	64.2%	56.5%	52.3%	47.1%	66.9%	34.2%	35.9%	46.5%	NA
Dec. 04 TWNDP	66.7%	59.0%	53.7%	47.4%	63.1%	44.1%	62.5%	53.8%	52.8%

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
Median									
Mar. 05 TWNDP Median	76.7%	54.9%	46.7%	47.7%	63.1%	59.0%	62.5%	53.8%	NA
Jun. 05 TWNDP Median	80.0%	63.4%	73.8%	67.6%	63.1%	59.4%	81.3%	81.0%	
Dec. 01 Home School	55.8%	53.8%	84.6%	77.0%	66.2%	75.0%	76.9%	76.3%	71.3%
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	54.7%	56.8%	87.8%	79.8%	83.9%	78.9%	58.3%	80.0%	75.5%
Mar. 04 Home School	56.8%	58.8%	89.7%	72.6%	95.0%	71.4%	26.5%	78.4%	NA
Jun. 04 Home School	83.5%	64.2%	90.0%	67.1%	96.6%	68.2%	34.4%	75.0%	NA
Dec. 04 Home School	93.4%	71.0%	82.9%	67.1%	86.9%	88.2%	66.7%	82.1%	77.1%
Mar. 05 Home School	92.2%	69.6%	69.2%	67.9%	93.4%	69.7%	67.7%	75.0%	NA
Jun. 05 Home School	90.8%	71.3%	90.0%	78.6%	91.8%	68.8%	81.5%	90.5%	
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%	13.9%	38.9%	48.6%	26.0%
Mar. 04 Extracurr.	65.9%	15.0%	35.9%	10.3%	35.0%	15.7%	41.2%	43.2%	NA

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
Extracurr.									
Jun. 04 Extracurr.	96.2%	13.9%	56.7%	12.7%	50.0%	30.3%	40.6%	57.1%	NA
Dec. 04 Extracurr.	72.4%	18.6%	45.7%	20.7%	39.3%	33.3%	46.7%	53.6%	33.2%
Mar. 05 Extracurr.	71.4%	18.2%	45.9%	21.0%	39.3%	34.8%	45.2%	54.2%	NA
Jun. 05 Extracurr.	65.8%	14.7%	53.3%	50.0%	57.4%	39.1%	66.7%	66.7%	
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	72	36	35	3,377
Mar. 04 Count	88	160	39	91	60	70	34	37	NA
Jun. 04 Count	79	137	30	79	58	66	32	28	NA
Dec. 04 Count	76	145	35	82	61	66	30	28	3,174
Mar. 05 Count	77	148	37	81	61	66	31	24	NA
Jun. 05 Count	76	136	30	56	61	64	27	21	

An analysis of the above data when compared to the state figure for December 2004 revealed:

For goal #1: **regular class placement**

- All districts are above the state

For goal #3: **mean-TWNDP**

- Fifteen (15) of the districts are above the state

- Hamden is below the state

For goal #3: **median-TWNDP**

- Fourteen districts are above the state
- Hamden and East Haven are below the state

For goal #4: **home school enrollment**

- Twelve (12) districts are above the state
- Hamden, East Haven, Stamford and New Britain are below the state

For goal # 5, **extracurricular participation**

- Eleven (11) districts are above the state
- Hamden, New Britain, Manchester, Hartford and Danbury are below the state

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 as a state there have been increases.

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 peers with other disabilities. Preliminary 2004 data indicates that 31.6% of all Connecticut K-12 students with disabilities participated in extra-curricular activities in the 2004-2005 school year. The participation rate among Connecticut K-12 students with ID/MR was higher at 33.2%. This suggests that students with ID/MR are participating in school-sponsored extra-curricular activities at higher rates than students with other disabilities. In previous years the ID participation rate was lower than the total disability population. 2004-05 is the first year that the participation rate for students with ID exceeds that for all students with disabilities.

In the **Third Annual Report- June 30, 2004**, the CSDE reported on a national study, *Social Activities of Youth with Disabilities*, (Wagner, Cadwaller, Garza and Cameto, 2004, National Center on Secondary Education and Training) (**Third Annual Report- June 30, 2004**-Appendix 7- Extracurricular Article) of extra-curricular participation among youth with disabilities. This study 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, on necessarily identical areas, an analysis of Connecticut's 13- 16 year-old ID/MR population from 2001 through 2004 indicates that Connecticut's participation rate for this age cohort in 2004 has exceeded the national study's 2000 findings.

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

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Percent Participation CT K-12 ID/MR Students, Ages 13-16	24.7%	25.2%	32.0%	37.6%

As reflected in other CSDE documents that present data on goal #5, including the **Second and Third Annual Report** to the Court, data gathered on the participation of students with disabilities in school sponsored extra-curricular activities is understandably more context dependent as compared to other goals of the Settlement Agreement 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.

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, it is recognized that the participation of students with intellectual disabilities in extra-curricular activities must be evaluated against the rate of participation among all students. During the approval process of setting targets with districts, the CSDE required that targets either be established based on a comparison with the state average or in comparison to students without disabilities in the district. The latter target required districts to collect extracurricular data for non-disabled students in order to do a comparison.

During this year, the CSDE met with the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS)-Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference (CAIC) executive director and staff, along with the state president of Special Olympics and the Director of Special Olympics

Unified Sports® Program to discuss possible collaborations to support goal #5 of the Settlement Agreement. As a result of the discussion the CSDE awarded CAS a \$10,000 grant to support districts in their efforts to provide interscholastic, intra-mural and non-athletic extracurricular activities for students with intellectual disabilities to be engaged with their non-disabled peers. CAS has provided \$1500 grant awards to individual districts that applied for these funds.

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, state agency, 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 2004-2005 data, 85.6% (2,718) of Connecticut's K-12 students with intellectual disabilities attended school in-district. This reduced slightly from 2003-04, when 87.7% of students with an ID were reported as attending in-district schools. In 2004-05, 456 (14.4%) of students with an ID attended out-of-district programs. According to preliminary 2004-2005 data, as presented in Table 14-2004-05, 124 (32.9%) of the 456 out-placed students with ID/MR placed by the District attended a RESC program, down from 42.2% in 2003-04.

**Table 14: Out of District Placement and Placing Party of Students with ID/MR
2003-04 and Preliminary 2004-05 Data**

2003-04						
	District (PPT)	DCF	Juvenile and Superior Courts	Parents, Physicians	Other State Agencies	Total
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Other Public School	49 (16.0%)	25 (31.3%)	0	8 (72.7%)	1 (8.3%)	83 (20.1%)
RESC	129 (42.2%)	8 (10.0%)	0	2 (18.2%)	5 (41.7%)	144 (34.9%)
Parochial/Private	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quasi-Public	5 (16.3%)	1 (1.3%)	0	0	0	6 (1.5%)
Private Special Education Facility	82 (26.8%)	24 (30.0%)	2 (50.0%)	0	2 (1.7%)	110 (26.6%)
Out of State	5 (1.6%)	18 (22.5%)	2 (50.0%)	0	0	25 (6.1%)
Other (hospital, shelter, other agency)	36 (11.8%)	4 (5.0%)	0	1 (9.1%)	4 (33.3%)	45 (10.9%)
Total	306 (100.%)	80 (100%)	4 (100%)	11 (100%)	12 (100%)	413 (100%)

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Preliminary 2004-05

2004-05	District (PPT)	DCF	Juvenile and Superior Courts	Parents, Physicians	Other State Agencies	Total
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Other Public School	27 (8.1%)	28 (28.3%)	0	8 (80.0%)	2 (20.0%)	65 (14.3%)
RESC	110 (32.9%)	7 (7.1%)	0	2 (20.0%)	5 (50.0%)	124 (27.2%)
Parochial/Private	6 (1.8%)	0	0	0	0	6 (1.3%)
Quasi-Public	29 (8.7%)	1 (1.0%)	0	0	0	30 (6.6%)
Private Special Education Facility	79 (23.7%)	40 (40.4%)	1 (33.3%)	0	1 (10.0%)	121 (26.5%)
Out of State	5 (1.5%)	15 (15.2%)	1 (33.3%)	0	0	21 (4.6%)
Other (hospital, shelter, other agency)	78 (23.4%)	8 (8.1%)	1 (33.3%)	0	2 (20.0%)	89 (19.5%)
Total	334 (100%)	99 (100%)	3 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	456 (100%)

Similar to last years data, the 2004-05 preliminary data indicate that a small percentage of students with an intellectual disability are out-placed, with the largest proportion (27.2%) of those overall 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 data presented above also indicate that between 2003-04 and 2004-05 there was a relatively large increase in the proportion of students who are reported in hospitals, shelters or "other" agencies. In November 2004, the CSDE sent out guidance to school districts regarding how to appropriately report the educational location for high school-aged students who are attending what the CSDE has termed "age appropriate programs" as part of his/her IEP/transition program. Typically, an age-appropriate program is a collaboration between an LEA and an Institute of Higher Education (IHE) or other community partners to provide expanded opportunities for certain students with disabilities for whom a typical high school environment is no longer appropriate.

Currently, there are ten such programs in the state. For the 2004-05 reporting year, each age appropriate program was assigned its own facility code. As a result, students attending these programs were no longer reported as attending their home high school in their home district. In the data tables reported above, these students are counted in the “other agency” category.

The proportion of students with ID/MR placed into a RESC by a District is small (110 out of 3174 or 3.5%) relative to the proportion of students who are out-placed overall (14.4%) 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 impacted by the placement of students out-of-district (see data presented below).

**Table 15-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:**

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%

Preliminary 2004-05 Data

	Median TWNDP	Mean TWNDP	%>79 TWNDP
All Students	51.9%	52.8%	20.1%
In-District Students, only	56.7%	55.9%	21.8%

The data presented in this chapter indicates that an overwhelming majority of students with ID/MR continue to be educated within their home school district. 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.

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 5. 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).

Incidence

In the **Third Annual Report- June 30, 2004**, (pg. 8) the CSDE noted that there had been a decline in the incidence of ID from 0.8% in 1998 to 0.7% in 1999, to 0.6% in 2002 (see Table 16, below).

**Table 16- State Goal 2-CT K-12 Students with ID/MR
Incidence* Rate from 1998-2004**

GOAL		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
2	Incidence of CT K-12 ID/MR students	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
2	Count of CT K-12 ID/MR students	4103	3939	3759	3682	3548	3440	3174

This 0.6% incidence rate has remained constant for the past three (3) years, with the total count of students with an intellectual disability continuing to decrease across this same time period. As a result of the concerns raised by the plaintiffs and EAP and the questions the downward count and incidence rate raised for the CSDE, the CSDE conducted several audits and monitoring activities during 2004-05 to gather further information to better illuminate the issues contributing to the decline in incidence and count (see MONITORING, pg. 70).

In the EAP Report- September 30, 2004 (Appendix 4) the EAP concludes and recommends that the CSDE needs to make “a substantive shift of philosophy on the part of CSDE to circumvent resolution of the PJSA by reclassification and phase-out of the I.D. category.” The CSDE does not hold nor promote to districts a philosophy to circumvent the Settlement Agreement by reclassifying or phasing-out students in order to reduce students from the class. The CSDE challenged this allegation and through discussion with the EAP and plaintiffs conducted several audits during 2004-05 to better illuminate the data around this issue. To best understand the position of the CSDE regarding this issue a historical context is provided.

As early as the *Connecticut Agenda* (1997), the CSDE has planfully and publicly provided strong and repeated directives to the field regarding the need for consistent and appropriate identification practices, providing planned revisions and trainings of identification guidelines in Emotional Disturbance (1997); Learning Disabilities (1999); Intellectual Disabilities (2000); and Speech and Language (2003). Most recently the CSDE has participated in revisions to the ADHD Task Force (2005); and plans to release newly revised guidelines for Autism (July 2005); intellectual disabilities (Fall 2005); multiple disabilities (fall 2005); and learning disabilities (winter 2005). The CSDE began examining 1998 incidence data (at that time data was not available to the CSDE until almost 14 months following its collection or March 2000) and conducted focused monitoring beginning in April 2000 in those districts with high incidence rates in various disability categories including ID. At that time ID incidence was 0.8% in CT, three of the highest disparate districts were Bridgeport at 2.4%; New Haven at 3.0%; and New London at 2.3%. These incidence rates were intensely scrutinized by the CSDE and the district, with resulting decreases beginning to be evident in the 2000 data collection, as expected. In November 2001, the CSDE, using 2000 incidence data (referred to as prevalence data in the first and second Annual Reports) identified 6 districts whose data placed them significantly above the state incidence rates- Bridgeport (1.5%), New Haven (2.8%), and New London (1.9%) continued to be high with New Britain (1.3%),

Plainfield (1.3%) and Waterbury (1.3%) added to the focused monitoring. The resulting decreases came as a result of initiatives to address appropriate identification, not to circumvent the Settlement Agreement.

In May of 2002 when the Settlement Agreement was finalized, goal 2 of the Agreement specifically included “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.” In order to accomplish this, the state expected and districts have responded with a thorough and specific examination of identification practices, making reclassifications, as the Planning and Placement Team (PPT) determines appropriate. These activities were monitored for compliance during 2004-05 with two (2) separate auditing and monitoring activities.

The CSDE examined the changes in classification of students with an ID in the twenty-four targeted districts from March 2004 to June 2004. This audit revealed a total of 171 students whose classification appeared to have changed. From further investigation it was discovered that 18.1% of the changes were clerical errors in which the student was reported as ID and had not been ID, or was reported as having changed to another category but actually continued to be ID. An additional 52.1% were found by the CSDE to be appropriate reclassification based on in-depth monitoring review of student records to assure compliance with appropriate identification practices and that sufficient information was available to meet the eligibility guidelines of ID. The remaining 29.8% required corrective actions as the reclassification did not meet requirements of evaluations or guidance on determining an ID. After corrective action, 86.3% met guidelines for appropriate reclassification and 13.7% were appropriately reclassified as ID. In conclusion the CSDE identified 4.1% or 7 out of 171 reclassifications as inappropriate (which the districts reclassified these students with an ID), 18.1% as clerical errors and 77.8% as appropriate reclassifications.

The CSDE conducted a more extensive audit during 2004-05 which more closely examined the twenty-four districts to determine if there was a trend in the re-classification of students as either learning disabled or multiply disabled based on consecutive years of December 1 data. This review followed a similar process requiring corrective action as appropriate to the issue. After corrective action, 72.7% met appropriate reclassification and 27.3% were appropriately reclassified as ID. The final findings revealed 6.2% or 6 out of 97 reclassifications as inappropriate (which were reclassified to ID), 25.8% as clerical errors; and 68.0% as appropriate reclassifications.

With this information, the CSDE plans to provide additional guidance to the field on data accuracy; appropriate identification of ID and further guidance on appropriate identification of multiple disabilities (MD). Additionally, data accuracy, verification and auditing plans are being developed to complement current practices (see section DATA ACCURACY, pg. 52 for current practices and ACTIVITIES, pg. 132 of this report for future activities).

Within this historical context, the CSDE does not agree with the EAPs conclusion and resulting recommendation re: “a substantive shift of philosophy on the part of CSDE to circumvent resolution of the PJSa by reclassification and phase-out of the I.D. category.” The CSDE has been addressing disparate identification through examining incidence overrepresentation since 2000 as part of its focus monitoring and race overrepresentation since 2002 as part of addressing goal 2 of the Settlement Agreement. With the purposeful attention given to this issue as related above, the CSDE would expect that districts are examining assessment practices to assure that the class members are appropriately identified as ID. As a result there has been a decline in student count, incidence and overrepresentation by race/ethnicity. While the audit and monitoring results of the two samples did indicate extremely small percentages of files as having inappropriately been reclassified to another category, this does not support the allegations of the plaintiffs or the EAP that the CSDE is supporting, promoting or encouraging districts to circumvent the Settlement Agreement through changing students’ eligibility.

For a detail explanation of the auditing and monitoring procedures discussed above, refer to MONITORING, pg. 70.

Race and Ethnicity

Districts are evaluated for disproportionate representation within disability categories by race/ethnicity 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 determining which districts were considered for focused monitoring during the 2004-05 school year, 2002-03 data was analyzed. In the 2002-03 data, seven districts demonstrated statistically significant disproportionate representation, of which three districts demonstrated disproportionality the previous year (New Haven, New Britain and Windsor); four new districts were added (East Hartford, Manchester, Norwalk and Windham); and two others (Stamford and Stratford) did not show statistically significant overrepresentation in 2002-03. For the purposes of focused monitoring, districts who did not demonstrate statistically significant disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity, but did demonstrate a high (greater than or equal to 2.00) odds ratio for at list one racial/ethnic group, received a letter from Commissioner Sternberg as part of the focused monitoring protocol as described in the **Second Annual Report- June 30, 2003**. Stratford, Trumbull and Groton met the odds ration criterion for students with ID. All of the districts that met either of these two criteria attended the second and third annual *Closing the Achievement Gaps: Connecticut Summit on Overidentification and Disproportion in Special Education* during the 2003-04 and 2004-05 school years.

Based on 2003-04 data, there are ten districts showing significant overrepresentation, either due to statistically significant overrepresentation or due to a high odds ratio

(greater than or equal to 2.00) in the absence of statistically significant overrepresentation. A review of the data over the past three years reveals several trends:

- All of the districts whose data was identified as statistically significantly over-representing students with ID by race/ethnicity in 2001-02 have seen a reduction in the odds ratios in 2003-04, indicating a reduction in the likelihood of minority student identification as compared to their white (non-Hispanic) peers
- Four districts demonstrated statistically significant disproportionate representation in 2002-03 data but not in 2001-02. Two of those districts (Manchester and East Hartford) have seen a reduction in odds ratios in 2003-04 data; the two other districts (Norwalk and Windham) demonstrated increasing odds ratios
- Except for Windsor and Stratford, the remaining eight have statistical significance or high odds ratio with the 2003-04 data
- While Stamford and Stratford, identified by their 2001-02 data but not 2002-03, are re-identified by 2003-04 data, their 2003-04 odds ratios continue to be below their 2001-02 levels.

During 2004-05 Norwalk, Windham, Windsor and Manchester received focused monitoring specifically for overrepresentation in several disability areas, including ID. They were required to develop improvement plans that will be monitored for implementation during 2005-06. It is of note that Norwalk and Windham's odds ratios increased, and the CSDE anticipates that intense monitoring of the implementation of these districts' improvement plans is critical. Conversely, both Windsor and Manchester demonstrated improvements, but will still be monitored for implementation of their focused monitoring improvement plans during 2005-06. Despite decreasing odds ratios for ID, Stamford and New Britain have significant overrepresentation in several disability areas and will be included in focused monitoring during 2005-06.

East Hartford, while not selected for focused monitoring for overrepresentation during 2004-05, was of concern due to their high odds ratio as well as due to a significant number of inappropriate reclassifications of students with ID that was noted during the class membership auditing that occurred this past year (for further detail refer to section MONITORING, pg. 70). East Hartford has been directed to develop a corrective action plan that addresses appropriate identification practices that will be monitored by the CSDE during 2005-06.

Of the remaining districts of significant overrepresentation based on 2003-04 data, Groton and Trumbull both have increasing odds ratios for ID and will receive monitoring for disparate identification-ID specific, during 2005-06. These districts will be required to address similar questions as those posed by the Commissioner in January 2004 to districts under scrutiny during 2004-05 (refer to **Third Annual Report-** Appendix 3).

Table 17: Districts (N_≥20) Identified with Significant Disproportionate Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group for Mentally Retarded/Intellectually Disabled Students

2001-02 Reporting 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 Reporting Year

District	Racial/Ethnic Group	Statistically Significant?	Odds Ratio
East Hartford	Black	Y	2.77
Groton	Black	N	2.90
Manchester	Black	Y	3.77
New Britain	Hispanic	Y	1.83
New Haven	Black	Y	1.32
Norwalk	Black	Y	2.92
Stratford	Black	N	6.80

District	Racial/Ethnic Group	Statistically Significant?	Odds Ratio
Trumbull	Black	N	2.80
Windham	Hispanic	Y	2.42
Windsor	Black	Y	2.59

2003-04 Reporting Year

District	Racial/Ethnic Group	Statistically Significant?	Odds Ratio
East Hartford	Black	Y	2.33
Groton	Black	N	3.00
Manchester	Black	Y	2.75
New Britain	Hispanic	Y	1.70
New Haven	Black	Y	1.25
Norwalk	Black	Y	3.00
Stamford	Black	Y	2.00
Stratford	Black	N	1.35
Trumbull	Black	N	9.28
Windham	Hispanic	Y	4.67

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 the **Third Annual Report- June 30, 2004** (pg. 40), preliminary 2003-04 data were used to identify six districts that statistically significantly overrepresented males as ID in that year. Analyses of the finalized data from that year identified an additional district, East Haven, resulting in a total of seven districts over-representing males as ID. Analyses of the preliminary 2004-05 data indicate that four of the seven districts continue to over-represent males: Cheshire, East Haven, New Haven and Waterbury. Stamford, identified in 2002-03 but not 2003-04, returns to the list in 2004-05. Three of these districts demonstrated slight reductions in the proportion of male students with intellectual disabilities since 2002-03: New Haven reduced 50.0%; Stamford reduced 10.9%; and Waterbury reduced 26.0%. Since last year, East Haven has reduced its proportion of male students with ID by 17.4%. Cheshire has not seen any significant

reduction in gender disproportionality. Bristol, Harford and West Haven no longer demonstrate significant overrepresentation by gender.

Table 18: Districts (N>20) Identified with Significant Disproportionate Representation of Males as Mentally Retarded/ Intellectually Disabled

2002-2003 Reporting Year

District	Male Count	Female Count	Total	Chi-square	Sig.
Bristol	30	12	42	7.714	.005
Hartford	138	99	237	6.418	.011
New Haven	217	126	343	24.143	.000
Stamford	46	27	73	4.945	.026
Waterbury	127	76	203	12.813	.000
West Haven	47	29	76	4.263	.039

2003-2004 Reporting Year

District	Male Count	Female Count	Total	Chi-square	Sig.
Bristol	36	17	53	6.811	.009
Cheshire	19	7	26	5.538	.019
East Haven	23	11	34	4.235	.040
New Haven	154	104	258	9.690	.002
Wallingford	24	12	36	4.000	.046
Waterbury	111	70	181	9.287	.002
West Haven	36	18	54	6.000	.014

2004-2005 Reporting Year (Preliminary Data)

District	Male Count	Female Count	Total	Chi-square	Sig.
Cheshire	18	7	25	4.840	.028
East Haven	19	7	26	5.538	.019
New Haven	109	71	180	8.002	.005
Stamford	41	25	66	3.388	.049
Waterbury	94	66	160	4.900	.027

It is noteworthy that, except for Cheshire, each of these districts 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 and were directed to participate in the activities described below.

Monitoring and Training

For monitoring efforts for the 2004-05 school year, all districts in the state received statewide color-coded maps indicating the significance of their overrepresentation using 2002-03 data.

Seven districts were identified as demonstrating disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity for students with intellectual disabilities, using the 2002-03 school year data. 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.

All ten of these districts, in addition to districts with significant disproportion in other disability categories had submitted explanations of their data to the Commissioner during 2003-04. Based on a review of this submission, four districts (Manchester, Norwalk, Windham and Windsor) were selected for focused monitoring during 2004-05 due to multiple areas of significant overrepresentation, including ID (see section MONITORING, pg. 56 for further detail).

The remaining six districts were expected to implement actions that were identified in their submission to the Commissioner. Focused monitoring materials and training were provided to these districts to assist in their efforts to address their overidentification issues.

All ten districts were included in the Summit III, *Closing CT Achievement Gaps: Weaving Our Vision & Commitment as We Share Our Stories*, held on May 26, 2005. In addition, there were 250 district and state personnel in attendance. The keynote speaker was Glenn Singleton who discussed racism as one factor that influences overidentification. His topic was Can We Close the Achievement Gaps and Address the Symptoms, Including Disproportionate Identification, Without Courageous Conversations about Race? State Representative William Dyson was the luncheon

speaker. Concurrent dialogue sessions during the Summit included Race Matters, Reducing Disproportionate Identification: What is working?, Cultural Reciprocity: Finding a Shared Space, Courageous Conversations about Race: Stories from Districts Hard at Work, and Improving Academic Outcomes for English Language Learners. The organization and detail description of the 2004-05 Summit activities may be found in Appendix 1-A Report of SERC's Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2004-05.

Evaluation/Identification and Reevaluation/Re-identification

In addition to Summit III 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.

In December 2004, EAP member Dr. Coulter provided a critical issues paper to the state to frame the meeting of school personnel held in January 2005. Dr. Coulter, Dr. Dan Reschly of Vanderbilt University (at the suggestion of the EAP) and CSDE staff met with school district psychologists and pupil services administrators from districts with and without disproportionate representation of students with an intellectual disability by race/ethnicity. District participants were from Bristol, Hamden, Shared Services, Danbury, Windham, Newtown, Windsor, and Manchester. This meeting framed the criteria for identification of intellectual disability and identified critical information to assure non-biased assessment occurs during the identification process. As a follow up to this meeting, the CSDE has contracted with Dr. Reschly to assist in the development of the final document anticipated for the fall 2005. Statewide training is planned for appropriate school personnel during 2005-06.

DATA ACCURACY

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 have undergone changes during the past few years, as discussed in the **Third Annual Report**, pg.11. Prior to 2002-03, 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, incidence data from the two most recent reporting years (2003-04 and 2004-05) are more accurate than was possible in previous years.

In previous years, the state has been cautious with respect to 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 2004-05 data the fourth 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. The CSDE expects that the most recently reported data, reflecting the 2004-05 reporting year, are likely the most accurate to date as errors in previous years are being countered by improved understanding of these data collections and definitions. The state will continue to work to ensure that these data elements are reported as accurately as possible (see DATA ACCURACY, pg. 52 for a discussion of data verification activities.)

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 initiated 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 were 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 anticipated 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 re-distribution into other disability categories. Over the past year, additional work on this system was instituted. During the course of this work, which requires that students be matched across continuous years of data, it was discovered that the process was not yielding significantly useful information to meet the expressed needs of the plaintiffs. Specifically, the CSDE was working to investigate the plaintiffs' concern that the enforcement of the Settlement Agreement was inadvertently provoking districts to, appropriately or inappropriately, exit members from the class by either re-determining eligibility for class members under different eligibility categories (e.g. not intellectually disabled, but another disability) or

exiting class members from the system of special education altogether. In discussion with the EAP in October 2004, a decision to discontinue the statewide tracking of class members and focus on the movement of class members from 1998-2004 within the twenty-four targeted districts was agreed upon. This analysis examined the impact of patterns of re-determining eligibility, exiting class members and identification of new class members on districts' incidence rates across the years. These data were presented to the EAP and the plaintiffs in January 2005. As a result of these analyses, several audit and monitoring activities were identified in conjunction with the EAP and plaintiffs. These reviews included auditing on students ages 18-20 exiting school; auditing on students moving from ID to another disability category, specially LD and MD. Each of these audits are summarized in DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 40 and described in detail in the section MONITORING, pg. 70.

Preschool

The CSDE continues to track preschool children with the analysis (described above including preschool students) of the movement of class members across the years. 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 (see Appendix F- 1998-2004 Pre-K Data on All Five Outcomes). All students who are in preschool programs are included in these analyses, regardless of age. For 2004-05 there were eighteen (18) preschool-aged students identified as ID. All students who are eighteen through twenty-one years of age are included in the K-12 data lists, regardless of grade (see Appendix A-E- 1998-2004 K-12 Data on All Five Outcomes).

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 ID/MR. 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 or not their child is a member of the class. The CSDE is committed to continually improving the quality and veracity of data relevant to class

members that is collected from districts statewide on an annual basis and from targeted districts on a quarterly basis. CSDE has engaged in and will continue to conduct data validation procedures that promise to improve the reliability of our data and the reports generated from that data on the progress of the CSDE relative to the goals of the Settlement Agreement. Data collection and monitoring procedures that will continue to assist the CSDE to more accurately reflect class membership include:

- Collection of data on students with ID from the twenty-four districts in March and June; reports generated from those data collections are to be sent to the reporting districts for data verification;
- Maintaining the logic checks built into the software used to collect annual special education data (Personal Computer - Integrated Special Student Information System or PCI). The software contains a variety of logic checks built into the program which must be satisfied prior to the submission of data to the CSDE. For example, a student record cannot be saved if the student is reported as exiting via a high school diploma, but the student is too young to graduate.
- Utilize database extract files and sign-off certifications of accuracy that require the signature of the LEA Special Education Director or Superintendent. These reports list both individual student logic errors as well as aggregate student data for review and certification by LEAs.
- Developing a unique student identifier and linking PCI data to the Public School Information System (PSIS), the all-student data collection (anticipated for all districts by 2006-07 reporting cycle);
- Dissemination of preliminary focused monitoring reports to all districts that indicate what their preliminary data looks like on key performance indicators, including LRE and racial/ethnic composition;
- Dissemination of data maps to all districts, which includes information on the relative standing of all school districts on all 5 goals of the Settlement Agreement;

- Dissemination in mid-May of the preliminary Special Education Profile reports (a district-wide summary on the state of special education) to each of 169 LEAs. These reports contain 29 different tables of district-level special education data, with comparison data for the appropriate Educational Reference Group (ERG) and State-wide data covering: prevalence rates, racial counts, English proficiency, time with non-disabled peers, education location, participation and achievement on statewide assessments, exiting information, certified and non-certified staffing information, and expenditure data. These reports are mailed to LEA superintendents, along with the LEAs general education profiles, for review and reporting of corrections to the CSDE. Districts have until September to submit corrections and Final Profile reports are mailed to districts and posted on the state website in November; and
- Other auditing and monitoring activities as issues and concerns arise. Examples include the data audit of students whose TWNDP decrease from one year to the next, audit of students who exit special education prior to age 21, and the audit of students who change from ID to another disability category within or across years.

Measuring Improvement in Data Accuracy

As reported in the **Second Annual Report** (pg. 51), in the spring of 2003, data verification monitoring was conducted within a subset (7) of the 8 districts originally identified for ID focused monitoring. Auditing in the form of file review and staff interview was conducted to specifically examine knowledge of data definitions and calculations and errors related to data entry. The findings from that monitoring are summarized below:

- A 6% error rate in the reporting of regular class placement data. The majority of these errors were the result of data entry inaccuracies;

- A 0% error rate in the data entry accuracy of reported eligibility category;
- A 25% error rate in the reporting of mean and median TWNDP. The errors in these data were almost equally distributed across miscalculations, data entry inaccuracies and definition errors;
- A 7% error rate in the reporting of home school data. The errors in these data were almost equally distributed across data entry inaccuracies and definition errors; and
- A 24% error rate in the reporting of extracurricular participation. Errors were overwhelmingly due to data entry inaccuracies.

During the 2005-06 school year, the CSDE will replicate the monitoring procedures employed in the spring of 2003 to determine if reporting errors due to misunderstanding of data definitions, miscalculations and data entry errors have diminished since the original file review was conducted. The CSDE has established a target of ½ of the original error rate for goals 1, 3, 4, 5.

For Goal #2, since the original data verification activity did not specifically monitor for appropriateness of evaluations and implementation of eligibility criteria, the CSDE has established a baseline error rate based on the results of the monitoring of class members who changed disability categories (described below). The target established for 2005-06 is a 10% error rate for goal #2.

The baseline was determined by an examination of the changes in classification of ID students in the twenty-four targeted districts in two rounds of monitoring. In the first round, 171 files were reviewed for students who were reported as ID in March 2004 but not as ID June 2004. This audit revealed that 18.1% of the changes were due to clerical errors in which the student was reported as ID and had not been ID, or was reported as having changed to another category but actually continued to be ID. In the second round of monitoring conducted in 2004-05, the CSDE conducted a more extensive audit in the

twenty-four districts to determine if there was a trend in the re-classification of students as either learning disabled or multiply disabled based on consecutive years of December 1 data. The final findings revealed that of the 97 files reviewed that indicated a reclassification, 25.8% of the reclassifications were due to clerical errors. The CSDE will compare March 2005 and June 2005 data to determine if any changes in eligibility for individual class members are reported.

MONITORING ACTIVITIES

Monitoring activities have been conducted in several areas this past year related to the Settlement Agreement. These activities included:

1. Follow up to the 2002-03 Program Review- ID Specific;
2. Disparate Identification including ID;
3. LRE Statewide;
4. LRE-ID specific
5. Hearing Decisions-ID specific;
6. Class Membership changed to another disability category;
7. Class Membership exits from school prior to age 21; and
8. Reduction in TWNDP.

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**.

All districts were closed out for the 2002-03 Program Review during this past year (see **MONITORING ACTIVITIES** section of **Third Annual Report**, p. 54). The five (5) districts (Milford, Shelton, New Haven, Waterbury, and West Haven) that were additionally being monitoring through the Settlement Agreement during that review (see **ID Focused Monitoring** section of **Second Annual Report**, p. 60) continued to be monitored on the goals of the Settlement Agreement during 2004-05.

Disparate Identification including ID

In the fall 2004, statewide maps of 2002-03 overrepresentation data for all disabilities were posted on the state website and provided to each district for their review and use. These maps indicated three groupings (green, yellow and red) indicating level of concern of the CSDE toward overrepresentation for each district (Appendix 5). These maps were utilized to select districts for focused monitoring on overrepresentation.

The state goal of monitoring overrepresentation was to “monitor the racial/ethnic proportions of students with disabilities for disproportionate identification trends”. The key performance indicator was:

- Monitor any overrepresentation of students with disabilities, in specific disability categories, for all racial and ethnic groups, in comparison to the population of the district’s general education enrollment.

Data probes used to determine overrepresentation by race/ethnicity and displayed on the maps were:

- District high outliers (as determined by the standard error of the sample proportion using disability counts and percent by race/ethnicity) for children/youth of all ages (3-12) receiving special education and identified in one of the following disability categories: learning disability, intellectual disability, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairment, other disabilities and other health impairment.
- District disability odds ratios by race/ethnicity for children/youth of all ages (3-21) receiving special education and identified in one of the following disability categories: learning disability, intellectual disability, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairment, other disabilities and other health impairment.
- District graduation rates for students with disabilities, by race/ethnicity, in comparison to graduation rates for all students by race/ethnicity.

All districts received training in the focused monitoring process and were provided with the focused monitoring manual (Appendix 6) and tools (Appendix 7) for use within their own districts.

There were seven (7) districts that were identified with disproportionate identification in the area of race/ethnicity for members of the class during the 2004-05 year based on 2002-03 data. They were 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 **Third Annual Report**, Appendix B-1998-2003 goal #2), had submitted to the CSDE responses and actions to be taken to address their specific overrepresentation issues (section **MONITORING ACTIVITIES, Third Annual Report**, pg. 54) From this group of eighteen (18) districts, four (4) districts were selected for focused monitoring during the fall of 2004. They were Manchester, Norwalk, Windsor and Windham. Each of these four districts were overrepresented in the area of ID as well as other disability areas (see Appendix 8). The remaining districts (three of which were the only other districts in the state that had ID overrepresentation) while not selected for focused monitoring, were required to implement the actions described in their earlier submission to the CSDE.

Following the intensive on-site focused monitoring, the four (4) monitored districts participated in improvement planning in March 2005. These districts, in collaboration with staff from CSDE's Bureau of Special Education, Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction and SERC developed an improvement plan to address recommendations identified during the focused monitoring. Districts are currently finalizing these improvement plans in collaboration with the CSDE. The CSDE will monitor implementation of these plans through December 2006. Any corrective actions identified in the monitoring reports (Appendix 8) are to be completed and will be monitored through July 2006. The format of the plans is being recommended by the CSDE for districts engaged in any improvement planning activity required by the CSDE to assist in the integration of activities within the district and the CSDE. This format (Appendix 9) is based on recommendations of the Center for Performance Assessment (Dr. Douglas Reeves- chairman and founder) whose research-based approaches for addressing curriculum, instruction, assessment and planning are being promoted by the CSDE for use in districts.

In addition to the focused monitoring activities that occurred, the remaining fourteen districts (that included the only other three districts with ID overrepresentation) participated in year three of the State Summit on Disproportionate Identification of

Students with Disabilities. All of the seven districts with ID overrepresentation were in attendance.

For a complete overview of the monitoring system and tools used during this focused monitoring, refer to **CONNECTICUT’S SYSTEM OF GENERAL SUPERVISION AND FOCUSED MONITORING for Continuous Improvement for Students with Disabilities** (Appendix 6).

LRE Statewide

In the fall 2004, statewide maps of LRE data for all disabilities and PJ (LRE) Settlement Agreement data were posted on the state website and provided to each district for their review and use. These maps indicated three groupings (green, yellow and red) indicating level of concern of the CSDE toward LRE and PJ LRE issues for each district (Appendix 10). These maps were utilized to select districts for focused monitoring on LRE. The state goal of monitoring for LRE was “students with disabilities, ages 3-21, will have equal access to and be active participants in their total school communities.” The key performance indicators that were used for selection of districts were:

- Decrease the number of students in all disability categories who spend time in segregated settings as defined by 0-40 percent of their day with nondisabled peers.
- Increase the number of students in all disability categories who spend time in regular education classes as defined by 70-100 percent of their day with nondisabled peers.

Data probes used to analyze LRE and displayed on the maps included:

- District percent of all students with disabilities who spend 0-40 percent of their time with nondisabled peers.
- District mean time with nondisabled peers for students with disabilities educated in district who spend 0-40 percent of their time with nondisabled peers.
- District mean time with nondisabled peers for preschooler with disabilities, except those receiving itinerant services.

- District data on the five goals of the PJ et al. vs. State of Connecticut, et al. Settlement Agreement.

All districts received training in the focused monitoring process and were provided with the focused monitoring manual (Appendix 6) and tools (Appendix 11) for use within their own districts.

A pool of fifteen districts were identified from across four (4) population sizes of districts whose data probes indicated the most significant areas of concern. Six (6) districts and one RESC were selected for focused monitoring of LRE. These districts were Plymouth, Sterling, Killingly, East Hartford, Voluntown and South Windsor, with the RESC being LEARN (southeastern part of the state). One randomly selected district of concern (Sterling) and one exemplary district (South Windsor) were included, as well. In the fall of 2005 all fifteen (15) districts were required to respond to a series of data verification; analysis and planning questions related to LRE (Appendix 12). Based on this submission and data, the six focused monitoring districts were selected. Districts not selected for focused monitoring were expected to implement their actions described in their fall 2005 response to the Associate Commissioner.

Following the intensive on-site focused monitoring, the six (6) monitored districts participated in improvement planning in May 2005. These districts, in collaboration with staff from CSDE's Bureau of Special Education, Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction and SERC developed an improvement plan to address recommendations identified during the focused monitoring. Completed action plans are due to the CSDE on July 15, 2005. The CSDE will monitor implementation of these plans through December 2006. Any corrective actions identified in the monitoring reports (Appendix 13) are to be completed and will be monitored through July 2006.

LRE- ID specific

The most intense monitoring efforts to occur with respect to the Settlement Agreement were again focused on the eight (8) districts selected in 2002 (Bridgeport, Enfield, Milford, New Haven, Shelton, Waterbury, West Haven and Windham) and the additional sixteen (16) districts selected in 2003 (Ansonia, Bristol, Danbury, East Hartford, East Haven, Hamden, Hartford, Manchester, Meriden, New Britain, New London, Norwalk, Norwich, Stamford, Wallingford, and Windsor). During the 2004-05 year, an additional seven (7) districts were identified and provided additional attention, and all low incidence-rural districts in the state that had less than twenty (20) students with an ID were also focused on during the year.

24 Districts

As was required for the past two years, each of these districts reported ID student specific data three times throughout the year on the LRE goals of the Settlement Agreement. During the fall of 2004, the CSDE provided a teleconference (Appendix 14) for the districts to train them in the use of a tool to assist in targeting setting and program planning. The tool, referred to as an “electronic whiteboard”, offered the district the ability to track real time data on each student as well as to make predictive calculations. Data could be inputted and calculated immediately at the district and building level on the LRE goals of the settlement agreement.

In July 2004, the Superintendents of each of the eight (8) and sixteen (16) districts received a summative evaluation report (Appendix 15) from the CSDE that addressed the previous year’s data through June 2004 and action plan progress and provided districts with recommendations for the 2004-05 school year (see **Addendum- August 2004 Third Annual Report**, revised 9-15-04). Due to serious concerns with progress noted in several of these reviews, one third of the twenty-four (24) districts were required to have meetings in the early fall between the district Superintendent and district staff with the Associate Commissioner of Teaching and Learning Programs and Services, George A. Coleman, and his staff. These districts included East Haven, Hartford, Manchester, New

Britain, Stamford, Wallingford, Waterbury and Windham. For more specific information regarding the districts, refer to Appendix 3.

For September 2004, each of the eight (8) and sixteen (16) districts was required to have an action plan specifically addressing the goals of the Settlement Agreement, in response to the summative evaluation described above. CSDE made grant awards of \$25,000 available to support action plan activities. Grants were approved for all twenty-four districts after the following requirements were met and accepted by the CSDE:

1. Establish district percentage targets (percent anticipated at target date) based on numerical targets (number of students) to be achieved by June 2005 and June 2006 for each of the LRE goals of the Settlement Agreement. These targets had to exceed the state December 2003 figures and take into consideration the EAP benchmarks for 2005 and 2006 of:
 - Home school attendance
 - Regular class placement (80% or more time with non-disabled peers)
 - Mean time with non-disabled peers
 - Median time with non-disabled peers
 - Participation in extracurricular activities
2. Describe activities that maintained the district level team to include central office and building level special education administrator, general education administrator, general educator, special educator, related services professional, union representative, students with ID, parents and others as determined by district which meets routinely and regularly to address the implementation of this plan and monitor district data.
3. Include an activity and statement for at least one district personnel to participate in a participatory program evaluation process that will require 3 FTE days of meetings a year with the CSDE.
4. Include the activities and descriptions that reflect the recommendations identified in the CSDE's July Summative Evaluation.

5. Participate in student data collection activities to be submitted by December 1, 2004; March 1, 2005; and June 15, 2005.
6. Submit a mid-year and an end-of-the-year report indicating progress on each activity of the district's action steps. The report must also indicate steps to be taken if the activities were not accomplished and plans for the upcoming year.

All district plans, including the setting of June 2005 and June 2006 benchmarks, needed approval by the CSDE prior to the disbursement of funds. All districts ultimately were fully funded, although the approval process stretched until January 2005. This was due to districts not including summative evaluation recommendations in their plan and/or not setting benchmarks for June 2005 or June 2006 of sufficient rigor.

A mid-year participatory evaluation training was provided in January 2005 just prior to the districts' submission of their mid-year reports, due January 30, 2005. The mid-year report was required to follow a specific format (Appendix 16) established by the CSDE to assure coverage of critical components including actions taken, enhancers and barriers to success and next steps. The participatory evaluation training (Appendix 17) was conducted by faculty from the Connecticut Center for Policy and Leadership at the University of Connecticut. Each district was assigned a graduate assistant (Appendix 18) that was available to assist the district through June 2005 in the area of data and information gathering, displaying of data and use of data to assist in assessing and informing the district's actions toward achieving the district's June 2005 benchmark.

The CSDE conducted formative evaluations in February 2005 (Appendix 19) on each district through a review of the district's December 2004 data and mid-year report (Appendix 20). These formative evaluation reports to the districts included commendations, recommendations and required actions for the remainder of the 2004-05 school year (Appendix 21).

As a result of the formative evaluation, several districts (Bristol, Meriden, Norwich, Shelton) received commendation letters to their Boards of Education, recognizing their success in achieving outcomes of significance. Five districts (Norwalk, Bridgeport, Hartford, Hamden and East Haven) were identified for specific meetings with the CSDE to address continued areas of concern. For more specific information regarding the districts' formative evaluation, refer to Appendix 21.

In late May and early June 2005, each district participated in an end of the year self-assessment process during which each district was engaged in a facilitated self-reflection on accomplishments of the year, the impact of these accomplishments on the goals of the Settlement Agreement and activities planned for next year (Appendix 22). Each district had at least one representative in attendance while the majority of districts had multiple participants, including assistant superintendents of curriculum and instruction, general and special education classroom teachers, related services professionals, building principals, and directors and supervisors of special education. The SERC consultants who had worked with the district for the past year facilitated the process, and also participated in the assessment. CSDE consultants from the Bureau of Special Education participated with several of the districts to which they had been providing technical assistance and monitoring. The results of each district's self-assessment are found in Appendix 3.

The general categories of findings of these evaluations were compiled and are displayed below and included with more detail explanation in Appendix 3. Each evaluation will be more thoroughly scrutinize and findings analyzed to assist the CSDE in shaping additional activities for 2005-06.

District Action with Most Significant Impact on Achieving Targets

Service Delivery
Central Office and Building Administration
Professional Development and Consultants
Staffing
All Students

Data

Greatest Challenge

Service Delivery

Central Office and Building Administration

Professional Development and Consultants

Staffing

DCF

Greatest Success

Service Delivery

Central Office and Building Administration

Professional Development and Consultants

Staffing

Data

In July 2005, the CSDE will complete a summative evaluation (intended as a retrospective evaluation of program efficacy and to serve as a final review of the year) of each of the twenty-four districts to determine district progress during the 2004-05 year and to make recommendations for the 2005-06 school year (see ACTIVITIES, pg. 130).

7 Districts

During the 2004-05 school year, based on December 2003 data, an additional seven (7) districts were identified for more focused attention. These districts (the pool of which had at least 20 students with an intellectual disability in December 2003) were below the December 2003 state averages for the LRE goals of the Settlement Agreement, specifically goals 1, 3, 4 and 5. The districts were Fairfield, Stratford, New Milford, Cheshire, Middletown, Trumbull and Branford. As a result, each Superintendent received a letter (Appendix 23) indicating their district was being selected for targeted support and resources from the CSDE and SERC during the 2004-05 school year to address the goals of the Settlement Agreement. *A Step-by-Step Approach for Inclusive Schools (Step by Step)* training was made available for 15- 20 district staff members in addition to full fee waivers for any district staff member to any of the SERC LRE statewide training offerings for 2004-05. Six (6) of the seven (7) districts participated in the *Step by Step* training, with Branford declining.

Low Incidence- Rural Districts

In review of 2003-04 data the CSDE determined that the rate of change of the state was being substantially influenced by the changes occurring in the twenty-four targeted districts. A specific strategy was developed to provide more emphasis on those districts in the state that had low incidence ID populations (less than 20 students) and districts that were rural in nature. These districts, numbering 129 of the 169 districts in the state, were invited to participate in two days of training (Appendix 24) held in December 2004 (60 districts represented) with a follow-up session in April 2005 (36 districts represented) which focused on examining data from these districts; issues specific to low incidence and rural districts; and spotlighting low incidence or rural districts that were educating students with an ID in their home school and in the regular classroom at rates above the state averages.

Prior to the December session and again prior to the April session, participating districts completed a survey of critical issues in inclusive practice. This instrument was developed by the CSDE and SERC from lessons learned and the *School Based Practices Profile*. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain the impact of the training session on the districts' use of the practices and their district data. A comparison of the December to April sessions' data and an examination of December 2005 data will be used to ascertain impact.

The survey required districts to rate their degree of implementation and the level of importance of each item. The detailed results of the December survey are located in Appendix 25. The results of the April survey and a comparative analysis to the December survey will be conducted during the summer 2005. This will also be examined with district data in December 2005 to see if there were any significant changes in the data of those districts that participated in the December and April training compared to those districts that did not participate. There were 47 completed surveys, although not all items were scored by all that were surveyed.

Areas that 90% or more of the districts were usually or always doing included:

- Reviewing preliminary and final special education data, ensuring data reflect planning and placement for all students with disabilities
- Reviewing preliminary and final special education data to inform continuous improvement
- Examining indicators of student progress to assist in developing appropriate supports and services
- Considering regular classroom as the first placement option
- Systematically considering accommodations and modifications prior to removal from regular education

Areas that less than 70% of the districts were usually or always doing:

- Set PJ (5 goals) targets
- Participate in Step By Step inclusive practices training
- Utilize a district level team to examine use of inclusive practices
- Utilize an inclusion facilitator for some or more of their staff
- Utilize an external consultant who specializes in supporting quality inclusive programs
- Look to other districts for examples of successful development of quality inclusive programs
- Allot time to observe other students to improve amount and quality of inclusive education
- Utilize an administrative tool to track individual student data and assist in inform resource allocation, teacher deployment, etc... in ways that support inclusive education
- Arrange for common planning time for inter-disciplinary teams responsible for the implementation of student IEP's
- Provide programs and resources for parents to learn their rights to better advocate for their child

- Conduct the School Based Practices Profile (SBPP) and use results to develop an action plan to improve quality of inclusive education
- Plan for assessing the quality of instruction in inclusive settings that links instruction to student performance

Areas that were ranked 9 or higher on a 10 point scale of importance (10 being high) included:

- Conducting the School Based Practices Profile (SBPP)
- Having a district level team to help support inclusive practices
- Participation in Step By Step training
- Building level administrative support for inclusive practices
- Reviewing data for accuracy and ensuring data reflect planning and placement for all students with disabilities
- Reviewing data to inform continuous improvement

Areas that were ranked lower than 8 on a 10 point scale of importance (10 being high) included:

- IEPs linked to the general curriculum
- Central office support to increase and/or improve the provision of inclusive education
- Reviewing individual files to improve quality and amount of inclusive education
- Common planning time for inter-disciplinary teams responsible for implementation of student IEP's
- Programs and resources for parents that support advocating for their children with disabilities
- Surveying parent to determine level of satisfaction with educational placement and programming for their child with a disability
- Indicators of student progress are examined to assist in supports and services in general education classroom

- Plan for assessing quality of instruction in inclusive settings that links instruction to student progress/performance

Hearing Decisions-ID specific

Since June 2, 2004, there have been two 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 two 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 94.

Table 19-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	June 2, 2004 – June 1, 2005
Total Requests	10	12	15
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	2 – Parent prevailed in both cases- one for more restrictive programming (RESC rather than district) and one to assure full access to program

Class Membership changed to another disability category

In 2004-05 the CSDE conducted several audits to examine the issues discussed throughout the year at EAP meetings between the CSDE, EAP and plaintiffs (see DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 39 and DATA ACCURACY, pg. 50.)

Two audits were conducted consisting of 36 on site visits to review 268 student files to monitor compliance with appropriate identification and for gathering information to assist in explaining the decrease in the number of students identified as ID. An audit was done on changes in eligibility category from ID to another category from March 2004 to June 2004 in the twenty-four ID monitored districts. A second audit occurred on changes in eligibility category from ID to either Learning Disabilities (LD) or Multiple Disabilities (MD) from December 2003 to December 2004 in the twenty-four ID monitored districts.

March 2004 to June 2004 Identification Changes

The CSDE reviewed data submitted by the twenty-four (24) districts in March 2004 and June 2004 regarding all students identified in March 2004 as having an intellectual disability. The CSDE identified all students from the March 2004 data whose eligibility determination changed from Intellectual Disability to another eligibility category. The CSDE reviewed the files of one hundred seventy-one (171) students. The CSDE required districts to reconvene PPT’s for students whose eligibility determination changed from Intellectual Disability to another eligibility category without proper support and documentation. Of the twenty-four (24) districts, eleven (11) districts were required to complete corrective actions regarding fifty-one (51) student files.

**Table 20- Audit/Monitoring Findings of Files reviewed-
Changes from March to June 2004 from ID to another disability category**

Total	Clerical Error – Student was always ID	Clerical Error – Student was never ID in March 2004	Files that required corrective action
Total 11 districts 171 student files reviewed	5	26	51

As a result of the audit:

1. Of the one hundred seventy-one files (171), thirty-one (31) student files were noted as clerical errors (data entry-the student was always ID [five files] or was a clerical error-student was never ID in March of 2004 [twenty-six (26) files]).
2. Of the one hundred forty (140) files remaining, eighty-nine (89) student files were found to be an appropriate change and fifty-one (51) files required corrective actions.
 - a. Eighty-nine (89) of the files reviewed were determined to be appropriate change from ID to another eligibility category; and
 - b. Fifty-one (51) of the student files required corrective actions.
3. As a result of the corrective actions for the fifty-one (51) files:
 - a. Forty-four (44) files were accepted after corrective action that changed eligibility; and
 - b. Seven (7) files were accepted after corrective action that retained the ID eligibility.

LD to MD

CSDE reviewed data submitted by the twenty-four (24) districts in December 2001, December 2002, December 2003, and December 2004 regarding all students identified as having an intellectual disability. Data regarding the change in eligibility of PreK-12 students with ID who change to another disability category (LD or MD) were used to identify student files for review. Districts were chosen for this audit based on percentages of change of over 10% of the active students who changed eligibility category from the previous year. Files of PreK-12 students with ID who changed to Learning Disabilities (LD) or Multiple Disabilities (MD) formed the pool of files. The CSDE reviewed on site ninety-seven (97) files from eleven (11) districts (Appendix 26).

The CSDE required PPT's for students whose eligibility determination changed from Intellectual Disability to another eligibility category (either Learning Disabilities or Multiple Disabilities) without proper support and documentation. Of the twenty-four (24) districts, six (6) districts were required to complete actions

**Table 21- Audit/Monitoring Findings of Files reviewed-
Changes from December 2003 to December 2004 from ID to LD or MD category**

Total	Clerical Error – Student was always ID	Clerical Error – Student was never ID	Files that required action	Number of districts that require action
Total 11 districts 97 student files reviewed	4	21	22	6

As a result of the audit:

1. Of the ninety-seven files (97), twenty-five (25) student files were noted as clerical errors (data entry-the student was always ID [four files] or was a clerical error-student was never ID between December 2001 – December 2004 [twenty-one (21) files]).
2. Of the seventy-two (72) files remaining, fifty (50) student files were found to be an appropriate change and twenty-two (22) files required corrective actions.
3. As a result of the corrective actions for the twenty-two (22) files:
 - a. Sixteen (16) files were accepted after corrective action that changed eligibility; and
 - b. Six (6) files were accepted after corrective action that retained the ID eligibility.

Class Membership exits from school prior to age 21

In 2004-05 the CSDE conducted several audits to examine the issues discussed in section DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 39 and DATA ACCURACY, pg. 50. In addition to the two audits mentioned above, the CSDE also examined recently exited 18-20 year olds to determine current status and degree of successful transition.

A study was conducted to identify the exiting procedures for students with Intellectual Disabilities who exited from special education prior to age 21. A three year sample was generated and included data from the 2001, 2002, and 2003 school years. There were a total of four-hundred forty-four (444) students with Intellectual Disabilities from eighty-

five (85) school districts that were identified who had exited from special education services. The reasons cited for exiting were; a) the students graduated with a diploma, b) the students graduated with a certificate of attendance, and c) the students dropped out. The students' ages ranged from 17 to 20. A random sample was generated from the total number of students. Of the total, one-hundred thirty-three (133) student files from forty-nine (49) districts were chosen to be audited, representing 30.0 percent of the total number of students and 57.7 percent of the total number of school districts in the state.

An auditing device (Appendix 27) was created to review the Individual Education Plan for three major components; a) elements for transition, b) yearly goals and objectives from ages 13 until exit, and c) if the goals and objectives were provided at an in-school setting or in a community setting. A phone survey (Appendix 28) was also created to determine how parents, guardians, or the student viewed the transition process (Appendix 29). Site visits were conducted at forty-nine (49) school districts to review the one-hundred thirty-three (133) files. Phone interviews were able to be conducted for ninety-five (95) of the students. The CSDE requested that the interview be held with the individual that knew the student best.

As a result of the study (Appendix 29 and 30):

1. One hundred twenty three (123) student files were reviewed and ninety-five (95) phone interviews were conducted;
2. The CSDE found both in file reviews and during the interviews that individual practices were being implemented by the Districts;
3. The CSDE found the number of goals and objectives for employment/postsecondary, community participation, self-help increased as the students increased in age;
4. The CSDE found the interview respondents agreed with the exit criteria in 79% of the cases and felt that the students were prepared to exit;
5. The CSDE found that half of the students who were employed during high school were employed post high school; and

6. The CSDE found for the students who were employed during high school, their programming included a balance of work study coupled with some type of academics.

From this information a best practice document on transition for students with intellectual disabilities is being written for dissemination in the fall 2005. This document is framed by the content's of the CSDE's **Connecticut's Transition Training Manual and Resource Directory**. Using this as an outline, examples of best practice for students with an ID will be incorporated into the text.

An agenda item for the EAP meeting in September 2005 will be to discuss the High School experience (for further information about the CSDE's efforts regarding 14-21 year olds, refer to HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS, pg. 119).

Reduction in TWNDP

In the October 2004 EAP meeting, the EAP made a recommendation to conduct an analysis of December 2004 data of students that have reduced their time with nondisabled peers from December 2003 and to implement interventions with these districts.

The CSDE in consultation at the October meeting with the EAP agreed to conduct the review on a selected group of students. Through this review the CSDE wanted to ascertain the issues causing a reduction in time with nondisabled peers for the specific student and to develop guidance to the field from what was learned through the analysis.

Districts that were selected were told this was a monitoring and auditing process to identify district's compliance and statewide trends regarding the appropriate determination of the least restrictive environment.

The following selection criteria were used to select student files and districts. December 2003 and December 2004 data were used for the comparisons.

- Districts whose total mean TWNDP decreased for students with an Intellectual Disability from 2003 to 2004;
- Districts with 10 or more students with ID in 2004;
- K-12 students from the districts meeting the prior two criteria, whose TWNDP data decreased more than 10% from 2003 to 2004; and
- Any student, from any district, whose TWNDP decreased from 2003 to 2004 to such an extent that the student moved from the federal category of Regular Class Placement (>79% TWNDP) to Separate Class Placement (0-40% TWNDP)

Using the criteria above, sixty-eight (68) students from twenty-seven (27) districts were identified. Each of the twenty-seven (27) districts was sent a letter (Appendix 31) with the following steps of the auditing and monitoring process explained, along with the identified student(s)' COMPID number(s).

The auditing and monitoring process followed four (4) progressive steps:

1. district to conduct data verification for each student on list attached to the letter;
2. if the data is inaccurate, the district will need to correct the data with the CSDE PCI manager and the BSE will reexamine the file in light of selection criteria; if district data is accurate, the district will be asked to send files of the student for the BSE to review;
3. based on the review of student records, the district may be asked to respond to a formal questionnaire; and
4. based on the review of the district's response to the formal questionnaire, the district may be asked to schedule a focused group interview to be conducted by the BSE with the school district's planning and placement team staff that determined the decrease in TWNDP for the student.

The requirement for the district to participate in all steps was determined by a review of the CSDE at each step of the process. The data verification and file reviews took place within the month of April 2005 with the other steps following as needed. Of the sixty-

eight (68) student files, nineteen (19) were removed from the monitoring as the data verification step yielded inaccurate reporting. The CSDE verified all data errors through an examination of the students' IEPs. Forty-nine (49) files from twenty (20) districts remained in the review.

Each of these districts were required to submit files and respond to a questionnaire as indicated in steps 2 and 3 (see Appendix 32).

The CSDE reviewed the responses to determine if there was supportive documentation of the student's time being decreased due to one of the following allowable reasons for removing a student from the general education classroom:

- Harmful effect of placement on the child;
- Harmful effect of placement on the quality of the services that the child needs;
- Harmful effect of the placement on the education of other children;
- Discipline reasons (expulsion, drugs, weapons);
- Medical reasons – child has been hospitalized;
- Residential facility other than educational reasons;
- DCF placement – treatment boundaries;
- Detention or Correctional facility; and
- Parental placement (private/non-public, non-FAPE).

A review of the forty-nine (49) files identified twelve (12) files that had submitted sufficient documentation to justify a removal for one of the above reasons. These students were discontinued from the monitoring. The districts and district staff for the remaining files were required to conduct case conferences. Districts in which more than one student's TWNDP decreased, or the student dropped from regular class to separate, were identified for site visits by the CSDE to meet with one of the teams that determined a decrease in TWNDP. All other districts were notified to conduct a case conference with the team that decreased the student's TWNDP following questions provided by the CSDE (see Appendix 33) and submit an attestation that this was completed prior to July 2005.

The CSDE is visiting six (6) districts (Putnam, Windsor Locks, Simsbury, New Fairfield, North Haven and Seymour) to attend the case conference meeting described above to ascertain compliance to regulations related to IEP development, placement and decision-making process to reduce the student's TWNDP. As this step is not anticipated for completion until fall 2005, final analysis of step 4 of the process (case conferences and site visits) is not available for this report.

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM

As stipulated in the Settlement Agreement, the CSDE has designed and has been implementing a system of technical assistance 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 has been described in previous annual reports. Below is a general description of this past year's initiatives, with specific detail provided in [A Report on SERC Technical Assistance and Professional Development- 2004-05](#) (Appendix 1).

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.

District Level Training and Technical Assistance

SERC

The System continues to be implemented this year focusing on those districts involved in monitoring (see MONITORING, pg. 58, 60 for list of districts). Specific SERC training

and technical assistance focused on the needs of the twenty-four districts with specific focus on six (6) of these districts (Hartford, Wallingford, New Britain, Stamford, East Haven and Manchester). The newly identified seven (7) districts in 2003-04 received the opportunity for *Step By Step* training of which six (6) districts sent teams. Districts having less than twenty students with an ID were provided with two sessions during the year specific to their needs. The purposes were to create heightened awareness in these districts' of the need to attend to continuous improvement and to focus attention on solutions to their unique challenges in creating inclusive programming. Additionally, statewide training was provided to any district interested, with increased opportunities statewide for districts to attend *Step By Step* training.

Educational Benefit Training

The Settlement Agreement speaks to the need of the CSDE to monitor the implementation of promising practices, availability of supplementary aids and services and participation and progress of students in the general curriculum. A primary focus this year was on identifying means to address monitoring of progress of students in the general curriculum. The CSDE hosted a consultant from California State Department of Education to provide training to SERC and CSDE consultants and several selected school districts in the monitoring strategy being used in California for the past several years to examine educational benefit (Appendix 34). During the two days of training and technical assistance, four (4) district teams (West Haven, Manchester, Waterbury, and Milford) participated. While this technique was highly labor intensive and time consuming, all participants found it very helpful in examining the development of an IEP for educational benefit. SERC and CSDE have incorporated strategies from this session into training that is being developed for 2005-06 statewide sessions on IEP development and educational benefit.

CSDE at the District Level

Other training and technical assistance was provided to districts through the roles of the CSDE consultants in their individual deliberations with districts throughout the year.

Consultants and CSDE administration met with district and building level administration and school personnel (Ansonia, East Hartford, East Haven, Hartford, Hamden, Manchester, Norwalk, Norwich Free Academy, Stamford, Waterbury, West Haven, Windham, Windsor); school boards (Torrington, Wallingford) and individual school board members (Manchester, Norwalk, Stamford, Killingly): and conducted training for teaching faculty, administration (Ansonia) and parent groups (Waterbury, Stamford, Windham, Hartford, Killingly, Thompson, Columbia, Mansfield, East Hartford, Berlin). Each of these trainings or technical assistance sessions was specifically tailored to the needs of the district. Some of these sessions were at the request of the district, others were initiated by the CSDE.

CSDE with Organizations and Groups

Additional training and technical assistance was provided to other organizations and groups throughout the year. Following is a list of many of these:

- presentations were made to CONNCASE district administrative groups in the EASTCONN and EDUCATION CONNECTIONS regions;
- discussion were held with the state's CONNCASE executive board;
- lecture was conducted at Southern Connecticut State University for school psychology interns
- DMR educational consultants
- CES region early childhood coordinators;
- Head Start statewide disability coordinators;
- multiple presentations were made at parent organizations meetings and conferences (see PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION, pg. 99);
- meetings were held with state and district (Stamford) Connecticut Education Association (CEA) union representatives; and
- presentation made to statewide district-level curriculum directors of the visual and performing arts.

Pre-service Training

Over the past several years, efforts of the CSDE have addressed higher education issues related to certification requirements; curriculum offerings; faculty training and leadership, as related to the education of students with disabilities, including the education of students in general education environments.

Currently a certification task force is examining requirements with discussions including the role of special educators in general education classrooms and the preparedness of these staff to teach content area subjects, and the preparedness of general educators to teach diverse populations.

Connecticut's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Council (CSPD Council), which includes representatives from the higher education institutions that offer programs in special education teacher and related services preparation, provides on-going recommendations regarding pre-service training. Their most recent planning retreat incorporated key CSDE consultants and managers to address future areas of focus of which one area discussed was pre-service training regarding inclusive education.

State Personnel Development Grant funds are being sought to support paraprofessionals becoming highly qualified teachers, continued parent training, and replication of best practices throughout the state. Discussions with the UCE on the implementation of the Coaches Academy have included strategies to engage Deans and faculty members in dialogue around curriculum and course offerings regarding inclusive programming for students with cognitive and multiple disabilities.

Consultants- Internal and External to Districts

The CSDE through the Coaches Academy, its higher education initiatives and its support of SERC is working to increase the number of qualified individuals to support districts and students with educating students in their home schools and in regular education classes.

Specifically the Coaches Academy's intent is to develop deeper knowledge and skill of in-district staff and RESC personnel to serve as Coaches to other school district personnel in their efforts to return students to the district or maintain students within the district in regular education environments (see COACHES ACADEMY, pg. 91 for further detail).

Team Training

Another EAP recommendation with regard to training and technical assistance was that guided training should be conducted with building level teams of general and special educators, parents and paraprofessionals and mandatory principal participation. This has been the practice for many years at SERC and the CSDE for specific types of training. Many SERC trainings have and do require teams particularly when systemic change is needed or administrative support is necessary to implement what is learned at the training. The *Step By Step* training has always required teams and for several years, principal attendance. CSDE and SERC agree that paraprofessionals should be a part of the training. Parents have always been suggested team members, although the training was not designed for teams that included parents. Parents that have attended indicated that there was some material that was useful, but not enough to attend all three days. While CSDE or SERC cannot revise this training because it is copyrighted, developing an orientation of *Step By Step* for parents to be offered during 2005-06 will be discussed with Stetson and Associates who copyright the training.

Diversity of Staff

In the EAP's September 30, 2004 report to the court, the EAP recommended that the CSDE "should examine the diversity of its technical assistance teams and all others that are working in local districts on PJ. The diversity of staff, especially those working in more urban districts, is essential" Following is information of which the EAP may not have been aware of at the time of the recommendation as the CSDE does not recollect this recommendation having ever been raised by the EAP at any previous meeting or within any prior report.

Of the CSDE consultants that monitored and provided technical assistance and training to districts during 2003-04 and 2004-05 and of the SERC consultants that provided training and technical assistance during 2003-04 and 2004-05, twenty-five percent of the staff from both groups represented racial minorities. These minority groups included Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, and Hispanic (non-white). Of great importance to the CSDE and SERC is the awareness, sensitivity and responsiveness of consultants to race/ethnicity of the constituent groups with which each work.

CSDE has contracted with PEACE Associates to conduct a study on the responsiveness of CSDE to race/ethnicity and culture in its mission and role in state education (see Appendix 35). The results of this study will provide information to the CSDE in its Department strategic five year plan being developed for 2006-2011.

SERC has worked with Glenn Singleton, President, Pacific Educational Group, in San Francisco, California over the past two years on issues of race. During the 2003-04 school year, Glenn worked with the SERC Consultants to facilitate *Courageous Conversation on Race*. Glenn has worked with educators worldwide in his passion to help school systems open the conversation on how to close the achievement gap by moving the discussion on race beyond traditional diversity talk. Glenn works with educators to better understand how to address systematic educational inequity and to better meet the needs of underserved students of color. In addition to his work with school districts across the country, Glenn teaches a graduate seminar on educational equity at the University of California, Berkeley, and San Jose State University.

Glenn's work with the SERC Consultants during the 2003-2004 school year was designed to increase Consultants awareness of race and its impact upon educational equity. The intent was to build SERC's capacity to be better prepared to facilitate *Courageous Conversations* with Connecticut educators during the 2004-2005 school year.

During the 2004-2005 school year, SERC's commitment to Courageous Conversations was agency-wide and included several CSDE participants, some of whom were engaged in the PJ Settlement Activities. Every SERC staff member participated in *Courageous Conversations on Race* facilitated by Glenn four times throughout the year. Each SERC staff member was assigned to a Courageous Conversations group within the agency. During each of the intercessions between Glenn's visits, Courageous Conversations groups met to continue the work that had been introduced by Glenn during the training session. Additional time was allocated throughout the year for Courageous Conversations groups to meet on an on-going basis.

In addition to the agency wide commitment to *Courageous Conversations on Race*, selected SERC Consultants worked in teams and began to facilitate Courageous Conversations on Race with district teams, including CSDE consultants, from five Connecticut school districts. These Consultants met with Glenn for additional training and coaching beyond the agency-wide work to prepare them for their work with the district teams.

SERC plans to continue *Courageous Conversations on Race* agency-wide during the 2005-2006 school year and will continue to contract with Glenn Singleton and Pacific Educational Group. Glenn will work with SERC Courageous Conversations groups throughout the year. In addition, Glenn will continue to provide training and technical assistance to SERC Consultants that are working with district teams to facilitate Courageous Conversations on Race. CSDE management and consultants are also included in some of these teams.

In August 2004, Connecticut was selected as one of nine states to receive a grant from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCREST). NCCREST is working with Connecticut by providing technical assistance and information on best practices from the research on reducing disproportionality.

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 discretionary funds for professional development 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 third 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 2004-05 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 36). 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: 2004-05, Appendix 1)

The third area of focus that continued this year addressed 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. **A RESOURCE DIRECTORY OF SPECIALISTS: Educating Students With An Intellectual Disability in General Education Environments** (Appendix 37) was published and disseminated during 2004-05 to directors of special education in each district in the state, with copies made available through CPAC and SERC. Additionally, the directory was placed on the state website of resources in special education and can be accessed at the following web address: http://www.state.ct.us/sde/deps/special/ResourceDir_Qualified_Specialists.pdf.

The fourth avenue being pursued is the CSDE's participation with an external provider (which has been identified as the University of Connecticut's Center for Excellence-UCE) to implement the Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team (refer to COACHES ACADEMY, pg X and IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, pg. X). In addition, the CSDE has had initial discussions with the UCE as part of the Coaches Academy grant, to engage Deans and faculty from institutions of higher education in dialogue regarding pre-service training that supports inclusive programming.

Through these four avenues, the CSDE has worked to increase the number of qualified specialists available and utilized by districts. The EAP has recommended that districts include line items in budgets for outside personnel to be utilized in their districts and for

the CSDE to solicit information about on-site contributions of outside consultants as well as reflections on CSDE's own participation. The following information is provided as background on what has been occurring over the past several years that the EAP may not be aware of regarding these two areas.

Line Items of Budget

Throughout the course of the past several years the CSDE has promoted the use of qualified specialists to assist districts in their efforts to return students from out of district placements; to return students to their home schools, to increase students' time with non-disabled peers and to increase the number of students spending 80% or more time with their non-disabled peers. During the past several years, the CSDE has allowed and encouraged districts to use the LRE grants to fund external consultants and internal district "inclusion facilitators" or "coaches" to assist in building capacity of school personnel to be effective in including students in general education instructional environments; and to gather supportive documentation and evidence of impact of these individuals so Boards of Education will utilize local funds or other sources, such as IDEA entitlement funds to support these personnel positions.

During the past year, of the twenty-four districts receiving grants, nineteen had line items for internal or external consultants to provide consultation and training to school personnel. Ten (10) districts contracted with external consultants and two (2) had internal inclusion facilitators. There are an additional five (5) districts funding inclusion facilitators through other sources, some of whom were funded last year through this grant. Additionally, ten (10) districts utilized funds for other professional development opportunities for their staff.

Over 75% of the IDEA 2005-06 entitlement grant applications have been reviewed to date with the following findings: 13% included internal personnel responsible for inclusionary education; and 27% have directed funds for external inclusionary consultants. In all but ten (10) of the grants, there is language to either tutors or

paraprofessionals being employed for inclusionary education in general education. At least 95% of the districts are targeting some of their federal funds towards providing some level of inclusion for disabled students.

Contributions of Consultants

A variety of sources were used to gather information related to this recommendation.

The program evaluation conducted by the Center for Education Policy Analysis indicated that effectiveness of consultants was seen as mixed, and was related to the internal capacity and stage of inclusiveness of the district. Where districts could adapt the training or technical assistance provided by the consultant(s) to meet their contextual conditions and to integrate it into their ongoing professional development, successful inclusive practices were realized. For example, those districts that have adapted differentiated instruction systemically have reached a high level of comfort with inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities. In other cases in which inclusive programming was limited, the training provided by the consultant(s) appeared to be patchwork and did not take hold systemically. Additionally it was noted that SERC workshops and training provided district personnel with tools (e.g., Stetson planning matrices, SBPP), processes for team development (e.g., *Step by Step*), and professional modeling (e.g., of differentiated instruction).

As part of the end of the year evaluation facilitated with each district (refer to MONITORING, pg. X for further discussion of this evaluation) each was asked to share with the other districts present their greatest success and what action had the most significant impact on movement towards their targets. Several of the responses, while not solicited for this purpose, mentioned the success and significant impact of having consultants. Having an inclusion facilitator was cited three (3) times; utilizing external consultants was sighted three (3) times, SERC was cited one (1) time; and *Step By Step* training was cited two (2) times.

With regard to Districts' impressions with the CSDE, the evaluators also noted that once the districts and the CSDE established a working relationship, the district saw the CSDE consultants as being responsive and supportive, serving as a bridge between internal capacity and external expertise; "We've created a professional dialogue."

These are several of the mechanisms used over the past several years to promote the use of qualified specialists and to solicit feedback on consultants and CSDE's impact in districts. Additional information will be gathered through the program evaluation studies that are components of the Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team.

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. 78.

COACHES ACADEMY

Based on recommendations from the EAP, the CSDE moved forward with the development of a Coaches Academy through the development of an RFP during the 2004-05 year. Following the CSDE's process for grants, the CSDE developed an application, conducted a bidder's conference, reviewed grant applications, and identified a recipient (University of Connecticut A.J. Pappanikou Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research , and Service; hereafter referred to as the UCE). Currently, the CSDE is completing the required Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) steps to disperse the funds to the UCE. Additionally, the CSDE is meeting with the project directors to coordinate, discuss and agree on details related to the project and budget. It is anticipated that the grant will be awarded from July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006 for implementation.

The grant application (Appendix 38) included the recommendations of the EAP from their January 30, 2004 report (Appendix 39, section D. Building Capacity) including the involvement of personnel from institutions of higher education, job-embedded coaching, and engagement of principals. In January 2005 announcements were sent out and a bidder's conference was held (Appendix 40). Six (6) organizations were represented at the bidder's conference. Applications were received from two (2) organizations (UCE and Capitol Region Education Council-CREC) whose proposals created collaborations with other multiple organizations. Proposals were read and scored by a review committee including three (3) EAP members; two (2) CSDE consultants; and one (1) SERC consultant. The UCE proposal was identified as the grant to be funded.

In preparation for the Coaches Academy during the summer and fall of 2004, the CSDE convened a consortium of invited representatives from the RESC Alliance, Southern Connecticut State University, Central Connecticut State University, the UCE, CSDE, SERC, school district personnel, parent organizations and other private independent consultants who have expertise in educating students with intellectual disabilities in

general education classes. This group of individuals (see Appendix 41) identified the Coaches Academy's competencies (see Appendix 42), lesson designs, and training materials for use by the Coaches Academy instructors and mentors.

IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM

Based on recommendations from the EAP, the CSDE moved forward with the development of an Immediate Student Response Team, through the development of an RFP during the 2004-05 year. Following the CSDE's process for grants, the CSDE developed an application, conducted a bidder's conference, reviewed grant applications, and identified a recipient (University of Connecticut A.J. Pappanikou Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research , and Service; hereafter referred to as the UCE). Currently, the CSDE is completing the required Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) steps to disperse the funds to the UCE. Additionally, the CSDE is meeting with the project directors to coordinate, discuss and agree on details related to the project and budget. It is anticipated that the grant will be awarded from July 1, 2005- June 30, 2006 for implementation.

The grant application (Appendix 38) was reviewed at a bidder's conference in January 2005 (Appendix X). Six (6) organizations were represented at the bidder's conference. Applications were received from two (2) organizations (UCE and CREC) whose proposals created collaborations with other multiple organizations. Proposals were read and scored by a review committee including three (3) EAP members; two (2) CSDE consultants; and one (1) SERC consultant. The UCE proposal was identified as the grant to be funded.

The CSDE and UCE anticipate that this project will be initiated at the opening of schools in September 2005.

**COMPLAINT RESOLUTION, MEDIATION AND
IMPARTIAL DUE PROCESS HEARING**

The CSDE has recently completed revision of the administrative complaint process to insure consistency with all requirements 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 2005.

As part of the continued monitoring process, 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 2, 2004 through June 21, 2005 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 June 2, 2004 through June 1, 2005 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 June 2, 2004 through June 1, 2005 there were zero (0) 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*. This is a decrease from last year when seven (7) complaints were filed.

Impartial Due Process Hearing Requests

From June 2, 2004 through June 1, 2005 there were 15 requests for an impartial due process hearing for students with an ID.

Table 22: Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings, including those with Mediation Requests, For Students Identified as Having an Intellectual Disability*

Attributes	Number of Requests July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004	Number of Requests June 2, 2004 – June 1, 2005
Total Requests	12	15
Hearing officer rendered a final decision and order on the issues	1- LEA prevailed for more inclusive programming	2 – Parent prevailed in both cases-one for more restrictive programming (RESC rather than district) and one to assure full access to program
Withdrawn by party initiating request	2	3
Dismissed by hearing officer	9	6
Mediated-Agreement reached	2	1
Mediated-No agreement reached	2	2
Requested by parent	11	10
Requested by district	1	2
3-5 year olds	1	0
6-11 year olds	3	4
12-13 year olds	2	5
14-17 year olds	3	2
18-21 year olds	2	1
No age noted	1	0
Parent had an attorney	7	7
Parent did not have an attorney	5	4

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

**Table 23: Issues of Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings
for Students Identified as Having an Intellectual Disability***

Issue	Cases-July 1, 2003- June 1, 2004	Cases-June 2, 2004-June 1, 2005
Private Day Placement	5	5
Residential	1	0
Therapeutic Day Placement	2	0
Unilateral placement	2	0
Extended School Year	2	1
Assistive Technology	1	0
Behavior Management	3	1
Inclusive Education	3	0
LRE	3	4
Mainstreaming	1	0
Related Services	3	4
Independent consultant	2	2
Transition services- not secondary	1	0
Evaluation	1	2
Parental Consent for placement	2	1
Procedural Safeguards	2	0
Reimbursement	1	0
Graduation	0	0
Extended school day	0	1
Home instruction	0	1

**Table 24: Districts Having Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearing
For Students Identified as Having an Intellectual Disability***

July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004	June 2, 2004-June 1, 2005
Bethel	Cheshire (2)
Glastonbury	Colchester
Hartford	Darien
New Haven	Fairfield
North Branford	New Britain
Plainfield	New Haven
Region #5	Norwich
Stamford (2)	Region #5
Wallingford (2)	Ridgefield
West Haven	Waterbury
	Westport

Mediation Requests

From July 1, 2003 to June 1, 2004 there were three (3) requests for mediation. From June 2, 2004 to June 1, 2005 there were seven (7) requests for mediation.

**Table 25: Requests for Mediation for Students Identified
as Having an Intellectual Disability***

Attributes	Number of Requests July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004	Number of Requests June 2, 2004-June 1, 2005
Total Mediation Requests	3	7
Also requested Impartial Due Process Hearing	3	3
Mediated-Agreement reached	2	4
Mediated-No agreement reached	1	3
3-5 year olds	1	0
6-11 year olds	1	1
12-13 year olds	0	1
14-17 year olds	0	4
18-21 year olds	1	2
No age noted	0	0
Parent had an attorney	1	5
Parent did not have an attorney	2	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 26: Issues of Mediations of Students Identified
as Having an Intellectual Disability***

Issue	Cases-July 1, 2003- June 1, 2004	Cases-June 2, 2004-June 1, 2005
Private Day Placement/Residential	1	6
Inclusive Education/LRE/Mainstreaming	2	1

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

Preschool LRE	0	0
Parental Consent/placement	1	0
Related Services	1	1
Extended School Year	1	0
Assistive Technology	1	0
Behavior Management	1	0
Transition services- not secondary	1	0
Evaluation	0	2
Eligibility	0	0
Parental Consent/evaluation	0	0
Reimbursement	1	0
Graduation	0	0

**Table 27: Districts Having Requests for Mediation for Students Identified
as Having and Intellectual Disability***

July 1, 2003-June 1, 2004	June 2, 2004-June 1, 2005
Glastonbury Wallingford West Haven	Darien Fairfield Killingly Region #5 Region #16 West Haven Westport

PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION

Parent Communication

The CSDE has provided information to parents of class members via written correspondence through out the year, as well as through responses to phone calls and e-mail requests for information. In order to assure that all parents of class members receive information, the CSDE updated the data base of mailing addresses in January 2005. 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, 2004 by the LEA. LEAs were required to update the list with students who had been newly identified as having an intellectual disability and to provide the most current mailing addresses for the students. A copy of this correspondence is included in Appendix 43: Parent-LEA Data Base Mailing.

Mailings included updates on training, resources and organizations available to assist families, LRE newsletters, statewide conference announcements, the EAP Public Forum announcements and information on training provided by local parent organizations or school districts. The LRE newsletter contained an update on parent training and parent activities, as did the CPAC newsletter. A complete list of mailings is included in Appendix 44: Parent Mailings 2004-2005. All written information from the CSDE was provided in English and Spanish.

In April 2005, the CSDE was required by FERPA regulations to contact parents of class members and inform them that the CSDE was required to share educational information about members of the class with the attorneys for the class. The information to be shared would include, but was not limited to the student's name, address, date of birth, race and ethnicity, grade, school, district and data collected by CSDE on extracurricular participation, time the student spends with nondisabled peers as well as information about the student's program. Parents were informed they could request that information not be

shared, but must do so in writing to the CSDE. This correspondence is included in Appendix 44: Parent Mailings 2004-2005.

In order to ensure that all class members received the correspondence, the CSDE merged the three data bases of class members and addresses that had been established on an annual basis since 2002. A letter, in English and Spanish, was mailed to anyone who had ever been listed in the class member mailing data base. The total number of letters mailed was 6,298.

The CSDE received 51 phone inquiries in response to the letter. The following is a breakdown of the nature of the phone inquiries: 23 individuals wanted information, but did not want their son's or daughter's name removed, 19 wanted the name removed, five (5) were undecided and four (4) did not respond to multiple attempts at return phone calls. A total of 37 requests were received in writing requesting that information not be shared with the attorneys for the class. Of the families who called looking for information, many of these families were parents of six (6) or seven (7) year old children. This was the first correspondence these families had received from the CSDE regarding membership in the class because prior to December 1, 2004 their children had been identified as having a development delay, rather than an intellectual disability. Another group of calls came from families with limitations in their ability to understand the letter, including non-English speaking families. The third group of calls came from families who had children who had already exited the school district, so they did not understand why they were being contacted.

CSDE – Plaintiff Communication and Meetings

Since June of 2004, the CSDE, in collaboration with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) met with representatives of the plaintiff organizations and interested parent organizations on a monthly basis, for three (3) hours a month. In addition, sub-committee meetings were scheduled as needed. A schedule of all of these meetings, topics of discussion at each meeting, and a membership list for the CSDE Parent Work

Group is included in Appendix 45: Parent Organization Meetings and Contacts 2004-2005. As a result of these meetings, the following projects were completed:

1. Development and dissemination of a statewide parent survey to a representative sample of parents of students with disabilities based on race, age, disability, and location. The survey was piloted with 50 families prior to distribution. A total of 6,400 surveys were mailed from the CSDE to families representing 100 schools, statewide. All families received a copy of the survey in English and Spanish, a cover letter from the CSDE Bureau Chief of Special Education, and a thank you note from CPAC offering a free workshop, newsletter, Resource Directory and Parent's Guide to Special Education. A copy of the survey and correspondence is included in Appendix 46: Parent Survey 2004-2005. The surveys are currently being returned and will be analyzed by an external evaluator from Glen Martin & Associates. The results of the evaluation will be available in the summer of 2005 for review by the CSDE and the Parent Work Group.

2. Development and dissemination of a resource brochure for families of students with disabilities. The brochure includes information on state wide parent organizations and agencies that support families of students with disabilities. 30,000 copies of the brochures have been distributed to parent organizations, the CT Birth to Three System and LEAs. In addition, 5,000 brochures have been disseminated in Spanish. A copy of the brochure and associated correspondence is included in Appendix 47: Parent Resource Brochure. LEAs were advised to distribute the brochure during the annual reviews of student's IEPs. An additional printing is being considered. The Parent Work Group will make recommendations to the CSDE regarding future dissemination of the brochure.

3. The LRE sub-committee designed and participated in two (2) sessions for the CSDE annual LRE conference: Expanding Horizons. The first session was a panel presentation on the Benefits of Education in Regular Education Classroom

- Settings. Members of the panel included George Coleman, Associate Commissioner; George Dowaliby, Bureau Chief of Special Education; Lynn Warner, Assistant Director CT Arc (sitting in for Peg Dignoti); Ginger Spiers, President of the CT Coalition for Inclusive Education; Kathy Whitbread, Associate Professor for the University Center for Excellence, and Jennifer Olsen, general education teacher. The second presentation was a panel presentation on Success Stories from Connecticut Schools. This panel included five (5) families from different communities across the state. In addition, the group recommended presentations by Eileen Luddy, Kim Pisinsky, and Linda Rammler. Each of the recommended trainers conducted break out sessions at the conference. Parents were offered stipends and fee waivers in order to support their attendance at the conference and honorarium if they participated on a panel.
4. The LRE sub-committee recommended that the CSDE sponsor public forums during the EAP meetings. Public forums occurred on January 12, 2005 and May 12, 2005. Additional information on the forums is included in the EAP section of this report, pg. 108.
 5. The CSDE conducted six (6) focused monitoring site visits regarding the education of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE.) As part of these visits, a public forum was held for parents in each of these communities. A total of 86 parents attended the forums. The CSDE Parent Work Group provided recommendations for the structure of the parent forums as well as suggestions for questions and gathering of data during the parent forums.
 6. The CSDE Parent Work Group, in collaboration with other parent organizations, participated in a pilot training by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The parent group provided feedback on a national training module designed to train parents to participate as members of a state's focused monitoring team.

7. The CSDE Parent Work Group created a sub-committee to review the reauthorization of IDEA in comparison to existing state law and regulations. The CSDE provided a training session by a nationally acclaimed attorney to interested members of the Parent Work Group. The committee will be making recommendations to the CSDE for a revision of the current Parent's Guide to Special Education in Connecticut in order to reflect changes in the federal law.

The settlement agreement requires the CSDE, in collaboration with CPAC, to provide parent training through June 30, 2005. Representatives of the LRE sub-committee will be meeting with George Dowaliby and Deborah Richards on June 29, 2005 to discuss priorities and plans for future parent training. The CSDE fully anticipates that the Parent Work Group will continue to advise the CSDE in our efforts to inform and train parents so they may fully participate in their child's educational program.

One on One Parent Support

In July 2004, the CSDE and CPAC provided training for Greenwich ARC (serves a large number of Hispanic/Latino families in the Greenwich and Stamford area) and AFCAMP (African Caribbean American Families of Children with Disabilities which serves families in the Hartford, Bloomfield and New Haven areas) to set up a network of people who could respond to phone calls from parents of class members regarding the Settlement Agreement. Each organization was provided a supply of the three page summary of the Settlement Agreement and the question/answer document regarding the questions families most commonly have about the Settlement Agreement. Participants also requested that the CSDE create a one page description of how a student is identified as having an intellectual disability. The parents in the group anticipated this to be one of the questions families would have, and expressed difficulty explaining the specifics of identification to families. Copies of these three documents are included in Appendix 48: Parent Training. All materials were provided in English and Spanish.

A letter was sent to each family of class members in these communities offering to speak with families by phone or to make a home visit to further explain the Settlement Agreement. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix 44 – Parent Mailings. The organizations were paid \$45.00 stipend per home visit. There was a limited response to the mailing in the Stamford area, resulting in two contacts to Greenwich ARC. The efforts through AFCAMP have been more successful, yielding multiple contacts and stipends of \$2,000. To further the efforts of AFCAMP to reach out to the Hartford, Bloomfield and New Haven communities, at the recommendation of the EAP, the CSDE has provided a \$7,000 stipend to support additional outreach efforts to parents of students with an intellectual disability in these communities.

The CSDE is scheduled to meet with representatives of Greenwich ARC in June to discuss how to further the outreach efforts in the Stamford community.

In addition to these one-on-one efforts, during the 2004-2005 year CPAC provided individualized support to 118 families who have children identified with an intellectual disability, and 86 additional families who contacted CPAC regarding the education of their child in the least restrictive environment. Professionals also contacted CPAC looking for supports for 17 families who had students with intellectual disabilities.

LEA – Parent Training

There have been three (3) primary initiatives this year focusing on providing opportunities and resources for parent training. These included the support of LEAs to provide training, the continuation of the Options and Opportunities training, and the Families as Partners training supported through the State Improvement Grant (SIG.)

LEA Conducted Training

As recommended by the EAP, the CSDE and CPAC continued efforts to provide training as locally as possible, and by the district staff that work with families on a regular basis. The training module that serves as the overview of the Settlement Agreement (Options

and Opportunities) was updated and a training session was conducted to provide training to LEAs and families to conduct the training in district.

A survey was conducted of LEAs in June 2004 to determine if local school districts were conducting parent training on LRE and the Settlement Agreement. A copy of this survey, and the results, are located in Appendix 49: LEA Training Survey. Of the 74 districts who responded to the survey, 46 districts reporting that they provided training/information sessions on PJ/LRE/Inclusion during the 2003-2004 school year. Some districts choose to conduct the training for all parents of students with disabilities, while others only invited parents of students with an intellectual disability. The trainings also varied by the age range of the students that the families represented. Some districts choose to bring together parents from a particular school or a group of parents who were being impacted by the agreement through a change in placement for their child. A total of 157 parents of students with disabilities were reported as participating in the district level training sessions.

In addition to collecting information regarding training parents on the settlement agreement, the CSDE required LEAs to include plans for parent education, information and training in their 2004 grant application to the CSDE for IDEA funds. A copy of this component of the grant application and results are included in Appendix 49: LEA Training Survey. The following is a summary of the number of districts who planned efforts specifically related to Inclusion/PJ/LRE and the method districts intended to use: workshops (45), conferences (22), newsletter article (18), written documentation (26) and committee/advisory groups (29).

Options and Opportunities Training

A total of 24 workshops were conducted by CPAC or CSDE staff for parents in local school districts or for staff who were providing information to families. These included collaborative efforts with local ARCs, DMR, Parent Organizations such as AFCAMP, and educational entities such as the Head Start Disability Coordinators. A complete

summary of these trainings and the number of attendees is included in Appendix 48: Parent Training Sessions.

In addition to trainings conducted by CSDE or CPAC, the CSDE provided \$2,400 stipends to the following organizations to support conferences that were designed to inform families of their rights and responsibilities: LDA-Wright's Law, New Canaan Public Schools – Inclusion Conference, Down Syndrome Congress – state wide annual conference, and DMR – Family Support and Self-determination Conference. The CSDE and CPAC disseminated information specific to the settlement agreement at each of these conferences as well as additional events. A summary of these dissemination efforts are also included in Appendix 48: Parent Training Sessions. A \$2,400 stipend was also awarded to the Connecticut Coalition for Inclusive Education (CCIE) to support their efforts in implementing the Settlement Agreement.

Families as Partners Training

As reported in the **Third Annual Report-June 30, 2004**, the CSDE issued two (2) State Improvement Grants (SIG) to provide joint training to LEAs and families to develop partnerships in the planning and implementation of IEPs for students with disabilities. A copy of the RFP which specifically required strategies to increase the numbers of families from diverse racial and cultural backgrounds who report participation and training, and satisfaction with the PPT process is included in Appendix 50: SIG Families as Partners Training.

CPAC and the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCE) were the two grant recipients, each receiving \$100,000 for the project. Although the training topics for each grantee were the same (Preparing for the PPT, Developing the IEP and What to do When you Disagree), the grantees used slightly different methods in conducting the training.

CPAC conducted a needs assessment with parents and the district personnel prior to conducting the training. This allowed for customization of the training based on the audience. The UCE provided a train the trainers session to select staff and families in the district, in order to use these individuals as part of the training team for that district. A summary of the districts and number of participants is included in Appendix 50: SIG Families as Partners Training. A total of twenty-eight districts participated in the project. The following is a break down of the number of parents and staff who participated in the training by each organization: CPAC: 254 parents and 213 staff; UCE: 132 parents and 84 staff with an additional 27 families and 40 staff participating in the Train the Trainers sessions. Due to some changes in staffing at the UCE, they have an additional eight (8) training sessions scheduled that will take place in June or fall of 2005.

The results of the training, including a follow up with participants on how the information acquired in the training was used, will be conducted by an external evaluator, Glen Martin & Associates. This evaluation will be completed this summer, and provide feedback to the CSDE on the effectiveness of the strategies used for this project. This information will be used for the grantee organizations to conduct a final training for LEAs in the fall of 2005. The LEA training will provide materials to conduct the training in district, as well as strategies used in the conduct of the training this year that proved effective in reaching out to families.

EXPERT ADVISORY PANEL

Meetings

During the 2004-05 year, the EAP met three times (for a total of seven days) in Hartford as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement. The EAP meetings included public and closed sessions; 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 conducted a session at the October statewide LRE/Inclusion conference and held two additional public comment sessions. The EAP meetings were held in October, January and May.

The public forum sessions were held on three separate occasions to provide school personnel, parents and other interested parties an opportunity to speak to the EAP. The forum at the Expanding Horizons conference in October 2004 offered a opportunity for participants to ask questions and engage in dialogue with the EAP members. The other two forums were offered within the context of the EAP meetings (see Appendix 51), allowing attendees to speak for up to three minutes to the EAP, with the opportunity for the EAP to ask the speaker follow-up questions. These two comment periods, one lasting one hour and the other two hours, provided the opportunity for nine (9) persons at the first session and fourteen (14) at the second session to share their comments with the EAP. Speakers included parents of class members; teachers; administrators; educational consultants; and advocacy group members. Representatives of AFCAMP and Greenwich ARC - Padres Abriendo Puertas spoke to issues of African American and Hispanic/Latino parents and children's needs. Issues of pre-service teacher preparation; successes of inclusive programs; struggles and challenges to achieve and sustain inclusive programming; successes and failures of schools; frustrations and joys of parents; inclusive extracurricular exemplars; need for separate programming options; and need for more inclusive programming options were many of the issues presented to the EAP during the forums.

Written Report to the Court

On September 30, 2005, the EAP submitted its second report to the court as stipulated in the Settlement Agreement. This report identified commendations, findings and recommendations for the CSDE to take into consideration in the implementation of the Settlement Agreement. Following are the recommendations from the report and the CSDE’s response to and status toward addressing these recommendations.

Table 28-EAP Report to the Court
September 30, 2004

Item #	EAP Consensus Recommendation	Resulting Action
A. State and Local General Education Leadership		
	General Education Leads Implementation of PJ	
A1.1 (C1.1 in previous report)	Responsibility for PJ should be moved from Bureau of Special Ed to the Associate Commissioner of Educational Program and Services.	
A1.2 (C1.2 in previous report)	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.	Refer to Section LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP, pg. 123 of this report
A2.1	Require superintendents of all but a few of the 24 districts to develop action plans with two year timelines to achieve EAP designated benchmarks.	Action plans for the 2004-05 school year required targets to be set and approved by CSDE for 2004-05 and 2005-06 utilizing EAP Benchmarks Refer to Appendix 52 for Action Plan Grant RFP.
A2.2	Communication between CSDE and district superintendents should proceed through general education channels.	The emphasis of communication has been routed to the Superintendent when the CSDE communicates with the district. Information, audit findings, meeting requirements are all

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

		sent to the Superintendent.
A2.3	CSDE targeted resources and interventions for the next two years would be tailored to the needs generated by these action plans.	For the past two years, CSDE targeted and distributed funds exceeding \$1.8 million, specifically to the 24 districts directed to make progress in and to achieve the goals of the Settlement Agreement. In many cases funds were delayed or not distributed, due to districts plans not meeting the approval of the CSDE to specifically and clearly address the goals of the Settlement Agreement.
A3.1	Consider a revision of monitoring by fully integrating special education data and program standards into a statewide departmental function.	Monitoring was revised this past year to include participation from the School Improvement Bureau and the consultant of Bilingual Education in Improvement Planning for focused monitoring. Other Bureaus in the department do not conduct monitoring, therefore the revisions were made to incorporate program standards and other statewide consultants from general education into the special education monitoring.
B. Published expectations of meaningful progress		
B.1 (formerly A.1 of previous report)	90% of students with ID be placed in their home school by 2005	Refer to MONITORING, pg. 56. Districts and state utilized EAP benchmarks in determining acceptable targets.
B.2 (formerly A.2 of previous report)	75% mean time be spent by class students with non-disabled peers by 2005	Refer to MONITORING, pg. 56 Districts and state utilized EAP benchmarks in determining acceptable targets.
B.3 (formerly A.3 of previous report)	40% of class students with ID should be in regular education classes for 70% or more of the day by 2005 and 80% by 2007	Refer to MONITORING, pg. 56. Districts and state utilized EAP benchmarks in determining acceptable targets.
B.4 (formerly A.4 of previous report)	The percentage of students with ID participating in extracurricular activities (excluding competitive activities) in each school should equal or exceed the percentage of typical students' participation.	Refer to MONITORING, pg. 56. Districts and state utilized EAP benchmarks in determining acceptable targets
B.5 (formerly A.5 of previous report)	A benchmark for non-discriminatory assessment needs to be established.	Currently revising ID Guidelines to address non-discriminatory assessment. Guidelines will be completed in fall 2005. Non-discriminatory assessment information will be

		<p>included in other disability identification guidelines.</p> <p>Refer to DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 48.</p>
B 6	<p>Develop new written policy on non-discriminatory assessment, communicate that to districts, design and conduct professional development for school psychologists on a statewide basis and assess the impact</p>	<p>Policy manual was scheduled for completion by fall 2004, with statewide training advertised and subsequently cancelled for 2004-05. Due to delays in receiving EAP feedback until December 2004, in meeting with EAP and school psych until Jan 2005, and in the availability of Dr. Reschly to assist in the revisions until late in the spring of 2005, completion and training is anticipated for fall 2005.</p> <p>Refer to DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 48.</p>
C. Competitive Use of Discretionary Funds		
C.1	<p>Grants geared to PJ implementation should be directed to school-wide systems change with timelines for scale-up with districts</p>	<p>No grants are anticipated to be awarded since this recommendation was made.</p>
C.2	<p>Grants should be increased in amount in order to create genuine incentives for large scale change</p>	<p>No grants are anticipated to be awarded since this recommendation was made.</p>
C.3	<p>Grants should be strictly competitive to stimulate creative thinking and a spirit of competition across the State</p>	<p>No grants are anticipated to be awarded since this recommendation was made.</p>
C. 4	<p>Apply negative financial sanctions against districts that fail to make progress on preparation and implementation of their local action plans. The sanction should be of the magnitude sufficient to generate enough strain at the local district level to ensure that the terms of the PJ Settlement Agreement become a local priority.</p>	<p>For the past two years the majority of districts did not receive grant funds until early winter (rather than early fall) due to unacceptable action planning. All districts worked to revise grants in order to ensure receipt of funds.</p> <p>Other sanctions were employed specific to the district (see formative evaluations- Appendix 21; and SYNOPSIS, pg. i)</p> <p>Districts were informed that for the 2005-06 IDEA entitlement funds, CSDE direction of funds may occur based on districts' data.</p>

D. Reduction in Membership of the ID Class		
D.1	Precise accounting for every member of the original PJ Class with an investigation of every class member whose classification has been changed	CSDE has conducted several audits to address this issue. Refer to DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 40, DATA ACCURACY, pg. 50 and MONITORING, pg. 70 of this report.
D.2	Make a substantive shift of philosophy to circumvent resolution of the Settlement Agreement by reclassification and phase-out of the ID category .	The CSDE does not agree that the CSDE holds or promotes a philosophy to districts to reclassification or phase-out students in order to reduce students from the class. The CSDE is addressing goal 2 of the Settlement Agreement which is to reduce disparate identification based on race/ethnicity and gender. For these reasons we would expect that districts are examining assessment practices to assure that the class members are appropriately identified as ID. See Section DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 39 of this report for further information.
D.3	Communication with local districts in action plans, grant proposals and submission, and all other discussion relative to the PJ Settlement Agreement placing strong emphasis on non-categorical solutions (a focus on all disability categories)	Non-categorical solutions have been the focus of all technical assistance to district LRE teams, meetings with Superintendents, trainings on LRE, parent training. While PJ specific examples and references are made, the message has been one of needing to change the system in order to affect the gains required in the PJ Settlement Agreement.
E. Program Evaluation		
E.1.	Solicit an overall, quantitative, impact evaluation study to begin ASAP.	Refer to PROGRAM EVALUATION, pg. 126. CSDE is utilizing results of program evaluation to frame a quantitative study.
Technical Assistance Training and Support		
	PJ components be developed for all ongoing general education professional development activities.	Two Department-wide sessions have focused on providing information to Department consultants on what to include in trainings, and how to address PJ issues in their roles as CSDE consultants, regardless of area of focus.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

		Refer to LOCUS OF LEADERSHIP, pg. 123 for further detail.
	Develop a list of outside consultants from the New England region who have clearly-demonstrated expertise in the various components areas of integrated placement and instructional support.	See Resource Directory, Appendix 37.
	Districts should indicate budgeted line items for outside personnel	Submissions for federal IDEA sliver grants and IDEA entitlement grant have addressed this. Refer to QUALIFIED SPECIALIST, pg. 86.
	CSDE should solicit evaluative information about on-site contributions of outside consultants as well as reflections on CSDE's own participation.	Program evaluation and end of the year self-assessments gathered information on this. Refer to QUALIFIED SPECIALISTS, pg. 86. for further specifics.
	Move ahead with involvement of IHEs as delineated in the Coaches Academy (contracts should be between CSDE and Deans of the Schools of Education)	Refer to Section COACHES ACADEMY, pg. 91 of this report Contracts have been developed with the University Center for Excellence (UCE) whose Director holds faculty status in the school of Education. Additionally, Central Connecticut State University will be under contract through the Dean of Education's Department for work on the grant. UCE is also looking to establish contracts with the Deans of Education at several other colleges and universities as part of this grant and the Immediate Student Response Team grant.
	Examine the diversity of its technical assistance teams and all others that are working in local districts on PJ (diversity of staff, especially those working in more urban districts, is essential)	Refer to section TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, pg. 78 25% of CSDE and SERC staff providing TA to districts regarding Settlement Agreement are of racial minorities. CSDE has just begun an independent study, by PEACE Associates, of the Department's cultural responsiveness. These finding will

		<p>provide recommendations regarding the Department's practices. (Appendix 35)</p> <p>During 04-05 focused monitoring, parents were selected to be on district monitoring teams that were racially/ethnically representative of the districts race/ethnicity demography.</p>
--	--	--

EAP Meeting Recommendations

Throughout the year, the EAP made consensus recommendations following each of the EAP meetings. Following are the recommendations from each of the three meetings that were held during 2004-05. Included in the tables are the CSDE's response to each recommendation.

Table 29-EAP Meeting Recommendations for 2004-05

October 21-22, 2004 Meeting		
Item #	EAP Recommendation	Resulting Action
1	<p>Conduct analysis of Dec 2004 of students that have reduced TWNDP from Dec 2003.</p> <p>Implement interventions with these LEAs.</p>	<p><u>In-Process</u>: Refer to section MONITORING, pg. 74 of this report.</p>
2	<p>Prepare report of interventions by LEAs who are not exhibiting satisfactory progress. Report to include baseline and subsequent data. Describe how incentives are used in this process. Provide prior to January.</p>	<p><u>Completed</u>: Reports provided to EAP at May 2005 meeting. Indicated to EAP at October meeting that data would not be available until after January and any further interventions with these districts would be based on a review of this data in February. Refer to Appendix 21 of this report.</p>
3	<p>Examine recently exited 18-20 year olds to determine current status and degree of successful transition</p>	<p><u>Completed</u>: Refer to section MONITORING, pg. 72 of this report.</p>

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

4	Guided training should be conducted with building level teams of general and special educators, parents and paraprofessionals and mandatory principal participation.	<p><u>Portions of this were already the practice of SERC-On-going:</u> Refer to section TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, pg. 78 of this report.</p> <p><i>Step By Step</i> already requires teams and principal attendance, and parents are encouraged, although the training is not designed for parents. This training cannot be revised as it is copyrighted. An orientation of <i>Step By Step</i> for parents will be discussed with Stetson and Assoc. who copyright the training. CSDE and SERC agree that paraprofessionals should be a part of training.</p>
5	District action plans should support building improvement plans and include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. knowledge, skills and dispositions ii. school community iii. instructional program inclusiveness iv. infrastructure v. resources vi. leadership vii. how district supports the plan 	<u>On-going:</u> As not all districts have school improvement plans, CSDE will utilize school/district plans when working with the 24 districts. The improvement plan format that is being promoted by the CSDE aligns with the principals and philosophy of the Center for Performance Assessment (Doug Reeves-Harvard) recommendations. All districts in the state, whether monitored for NCLB or special education focused monitoring, are recommended to use this format.
6	Select several LEAs having difficulties with implementation to meet with EAP at January 2005 meeting.	<u>In-Process:</u> Districts will be meeting with EAP in September 2005. Data was not available for review to determine district selection by January EAP meeting.
7	Provide monitoring reports and corrective action plans to EAP.	<u>Completed-</u> refer to Appendix 8
8	Provide CSDE transitional documents to EAP prior to January meeting.	<u>Completed:</u> refer to section HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS, pg. 119.
9	Provide oral comments on report for Friday's agenda	<u>Completed</u>
10	Create a Superintendent's task force to plan with EAP in January and conduct a meeting with EAP in May	<u>In-Process:</u> This will be accomplished during the 2005-06 year. Refer to section ACTIVITIES, pg. 135.
11	Follow up with superintendents on	<u>In-Process:</u> To be included in future

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	grants and change in parent focus	correspondence to Superintendents.
12	Follow up migration audits and choose 3 or 4 districts to conduct on-site monitoring, choose biggest departure districts (3-5) to carefully investigate, provide TA as appropriate, consider Waterbury	<u>In Process:</u> Refer to Section MONITORING, pg. 70 of this report.
13	Develop table of interventions for the original 8 districts to include SDE interventions as a status check, not elaborate to determine specific future interventions. Hold discussion at January meeting	<u>In-Process:</u> Refer to each district in Appendix X for the current status of this activity. Draft was provided at January meeting.
14	Shift parent training to more district based	<u>Already begun prior to recommendation:</u> Refer to section PARENTS, pg. 99.
15	Examine the legislation that allows for administrative designees at PPTs rather than requiring the school principal.	<u>In-Process:</u> refer to section HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS, pg. 119.
16	Put policy documents back on the table for EAP to review	<u>In-Process:</u> will be included on an EAP agenda for 2005-06
17	Send materials to Sharon	<u>Completed</u>
18	Dr. Coulter to meet with psychologists in January to discuss ID Guidelines	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to Section DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 48 and Appendix 53 of this report

January 12 and 13 Meeting		
Item #	EAP Recommendation	Resulting Action
1	Report on ethnic representation for ID by composition index and odds ratio for 2002-2004 at the May meeting	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to Section DISPARATE IDENTIFICATION, pg. 44 and Appendices 8, 12 of this report.
2	Review follow up report to audit of class members changing categories (systemic and student specific)	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to Section MONITORING, pg. 70 of this report.
3	CSDE to break out error types of class member audit to more clearly reflect findings.	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to Section MONITORING, pg. 70 of this report.
4	Continue age 14 as transitional age	<u>Accepted</u>

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

5	Set policy at Commissioner level that adult representatives attend initial transition planning meeting	<u>Considering:</u> refer to section HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS, pg. 119
6	Initial decision made for plan as to whether to continue IDEA services beyond date of graduation ceremony until age 21	<u>Considering:</u> refer to section HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS, pg. x120
7	All class members to participate in graduation ceremony with peers and receive certificate of accomplishment	<u>Already a practice in CT:</u> refer to Appendix 54
8	Level and type of support provided for 18-21 be encompassed in IEP as determined by adult agencies and more reflective of adult environment with nondisabled peers than high school environment	<u>Considering:</u> refer to section HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULT, pg. 120.
9	Of the 133 exiters, disaggregate by age at time of exit those students that exited prior to age 21	<u>Completed:</u> Provided at May meeting. Refer to Appendix 27
10	Disaggregate students that change eligibility category from ID to another category by age (groupings/or building levels –elem, middle, high)	<u>In Process:</u> This will be available for the September EAP agenda item re: High School
11	Respect parent choice in high school	<u>Considering:</u> refer to section HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULTS, pg. 119 and ACTIVITIES, pg. 133.
12	Provide a position paper/guidance on best practices and implications for programming at the high school level for class members	<u>In Process:</u> To be completed by fall 2005
13	Provide executive summary of recent surveys-disaggregated by ID	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to Appendix 55.

May 11-13 Meeting		
Item #	EAP Recommendation	Resulting Action
1	Report the status of all LEAs using June 2005 data for the 24 districts and December 2004 data for all other districts within categories of 1- initiation; 2-implementation; 3-	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to SYNOPSIS, pg. i of this report

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
P.J. ET AL. v. STATE OF CONNECTICUT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 291CV00180 (RNC)

	Refinement and 4 with cut-offs as identified on the flipcharts of the EAP meeting from May meeting	
2	<p>Include on the agenda for Fall 2005 EAP meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher union contracts as a facilitator/barrier to implementing PJ • Para contracts as a facilitator/barrier to implementing PJ • The High School Experience (and effective transition) 	<u>Accepted:</u> Teacher and para contracts to be mailed to Dr. Freagon for review in preparation for fall EAP meeting; High School Experience to be on the fall agenda (refer to section ACTIVITIES, pg. 133,135, for further information)
3	Change Annual report format to include an intro section that uses categorization described in #1 above and describe interventions to date in each group.	<p><u>Completed:</u> Refer to SYNOPSIS, pg. I of this report</p> <p>Further interventions will be identified at fall EAP meeting following CSDE's summative evaluation process that will be conducted in July 2005 for each of the 24 districts.</p>
4	Revise tabular reporting to include March and June 2005 data	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to DISTRICT DATA REVIEW, pg. 16, 21 and Appendix 3 of this report
5	Describe CSDE's long-term strategy for investigating and ensuring accuracy of data and set measurable goal for improvement in accuracy over time	<u>Completed:</u> Refer to DATA ACCURACY, pg. 53 of this report
6	Describe graduated levels of sanctions the CSDE plans to implement for lack of progress by a targeted LEA on goals that would be more intrusive than the meetings with superintendents that has been occurring.	<u>Accepted:</u> Refer to Section ACTIVITIES, pg. 129 and SYNOPSIS, pg. i of this report

HIGH SCHOOL AND YOUNG ADULT

Throughout the 2004-05 school year the CSDE has conducted multiple activities specific to the age group of students 14-21. In discussions with the EAP and plaintiffs, the CSDE explored the data and gathered additional information for analysis of students between the ages of 18-20 who were exiting school with a diploma, with a certificate of attendance by or dropping out. Additionally, the CSDE reviewed with the plaintiffs and EAP a variety of the policies, procedures and efforts of the CSDE in addressing the needs of this age group of students. The EAP was provided with copies of the state's transitional documents including *Connecticut's Transition Training Manual and Resource Directory*; and *Building a Bridge: A Transition Manual for Students*. From these discussions, the EAP offered several recommendations that addressed audits; policy considerations; district practices; data analysis; and best practices.

Much of the work of the CSDE in assisting districts to address the programming of students with an intellectual disability at the high school level and beyond has been incorporated into those activities that have occurred for any student with a disability. The interagency Transition Task Force has existed for many years in Connecticut and has collaborated on several documents to assist students, parents and school personnel on educational services and transitional services in particular for students with disabilities. These documents were referred to above.

Funds

The CSDE has spent substantial funds over the past three years to support the development of services for students ages 18-21 who are no longer of comparable age to their non-disabled peers in their high schools. This funding has supported services referred to by the CSDE as "age appropriate program services" that offer education, vocational and community training opportunities on college campuses. As these programs are not based at a student's high school, the districts have been instructed by the CSDE to record these student's placement as NOT the home school, thus resulting in

reduced home school data for districts whose students are engaged in these programs. Additionally, these students are reported in the out-of-district data in the “other” category (data reported in OUT OF DISTRICT, pg. 34)

Guidance

In addition to the guidance on recording home school for students in “age- appropriate” programs mentioned above, other guidance has been provided to districts with regard to data accuracy at the high school level. A December 2002 memo was issued clarifying the reporting of time with non-disabled peers for students receiving educational and vocational training in community settings (Appendix 56). Also, guidance was provided in March 2000 regarding students who continue to receive an educational program beyond the 12th grade and their ability to participate in graduation exercises with their non-disabled peers (Appendix 54). One area of recommendation by the EAP related to CSDE guidance and policy was for the age of transition planning to begin at 14 rather than 16. This has been Connecticut law for many years and will remain so, despite recent changes in the IDEIA 2004. The EAP made several other recommendations to the CSDE regarding interagency agreements for services to be available to students between the ages of 18-21. These types of interagency agreements will be examined during 2005-06 for determination of next steps by the CSDE. Currently, the CSDE is meeting with Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), Department of Mental Retardation (DMR), Bureau of Rehabilitation Services (BRS) and Board of Education Services for the Blind (BESB) to participate in the National Governor’s Association (NGA) policy academy to address interagency coordination and collaboration in improving outcomes for young adults with disabilities.

Training and Technical Assistance

While many of the activities have been related to all students with disabilities at the secondary level, several activities have been more specifically designed for meeting the needs of students with cognitive and multiple disabilities. During 2003-04, districts began to request information on where to visit and how to program for students in regular

classes at the high school level. For this reason, during the 2004-05 school year the *LRE News* (Appendix 44) has highlighted particular inclusive programs with contact information at the high school level. Several SERC opportunities were provided throughout the year specifically to address the educational programming of students at the secondary level including *Supporting Students with Intellectual Disabilities in Secondary General Education Classrooms; Educating Students with Autism in Inclusive Settings, Grades 6-12; Technology and Literacy: Supporting the Diverse Needs of Students in Grades 6-12; Transitioning Through School and Community Life: Part IV- Developing the IEP based on General Education curriculum; Person Centered Planning: Setting a Course with PATH; and Addressing the Social Skill Needs of Middle and High School Students with Autism* (see Appendix 36). Planning for the 2005 Expanding Horizon conference will focus on Connecticut successes in schools that are including students in general education classes, including services at the secondary level.

Many of the technical assistance days provided by SERC and CSDE staff to districts being monitored in the Settlement Agreement have been spent addressing issues at the secondary level regarding returning of students to public high schools from out of district placements; creating scheduling at the secondary level to support more flexible staffing patterns to allow for increased in-class supports; and utilization of curriculum frameworks for secondary subjects to develop IEPs linked to the general curriculum.

Class Membership exits from school prior to age 21

One of the audits conducted by the CSDE this past year was particularly focused on the transition process and high school services offered to those 18-20 year old students that exited school within the past three years. The information obtained through this audit will be incorporated into the discussion to be held at the September EAP meeting on the High School experience as well as the guidance paper currently being developed on best practices in secondary education for students with an ID. Below are general findings. For more detail refer to MONITORING, pg. 72.

In 2004-05 the CSDE examined recently exited 18-20 year olds to determine current status and degree of successful transition. The study was conducted to identify the exiting procedures for students with Intellectual Disabilities who exited from special education prior to age 21. A three year sample was generated with a total of four-hundred forty-four (444) students with Intellectual Disabilities from eighty-five (85) school districts that were identified who had exited from special education services. A random sample was generated of one-hundred thirty-three (133) student files from forty-nine (49) districts, representing 30.0 percent of the total number of students and 57.7 percent of the total number of school districts in the state.

The CSDE conducted site visits to review student's IEPs from age thirteen (13) through the age of exit and conducted phone interviews with staff knowledgeable of the student.

As a result of the study:

1. The CSDE found both in file reviews and during the interviews that individual practices were being implemented by the Districts;
2. The CSDE found the number of goals and objectives for employment/postsecondary, community participation, self-help increased as the students increased in age;
3. The CSDE found the interview respondents agreed with the exit criteria in 79% of the cases and felt that the students were prepared to exit;
4. The CSDE found that half of the students who were employed during high school were employed post high school; and
5. The CSDE found for the students who were employed during high school, their programming generally included a balance of work study coupled with some type of academics.

Activities planned for 2005-06 relative to High School and young adults are discussed in section ACTIVITIES, pg. 133

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 that have continued from 2003-04 to the 2004-05 year.

Communication and Training

The manner in which communications regarding the Settlement Agreement were issued to districts changed during the 2003-04 year and continued for the 2004-05 year. Historically, mailings were sent primarily from SERC or the Bureau Chief of Special Education to Directors of Special Education. During the past two years, 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.

Department Level Activities

Throughout the CSDE, initiatives have begun this year that address the EAP's 2003-04 recommendations regarding the role of general education leadership at the CSDE.

Department wide Sessions

During 2004-05 two meetings were held within the CSDE for all CSDE consultants to specifically examine issues of the Settlement Agreement and the changing role of the CSDE in response to its implications for all students, teachers and administrators in districts (Appendix 57).

During the February 2005 session, Dr. Kathy Gee, president of TASH and professor at Sacramento State University, presented on development of IEPs linked to state and district curriculum frameworks and facilitated the discussions throughout the day. Additionally, Dr. Wayne Sailor of the EAP presented to the group via teleconference on the implications of the Settlement Agreement on schools in general (Appendix 57). From this meeting actions were identified for next steps and connections were made across bureaus and divisions (Appendix 57).

During the follow up meeting in May 2005, consultants convened to discuss outcomes of the previous meeting, review of program evaluation conducted by UCONN's Center for Education Policy Analysis, and department next steps in meeting the diverse needs of students in Connecticut. Work groups convened to discuss the role of the CSDE in addressing the achievement issues of English Language Learners, students with disabilities, students of minority racial/ethnic groups, students in poverty and students of advanced achievement levels.

Department-wide Evaluation

This spring the CSDE has engaged the Stupski Foundation (Appendix 58) to conduct an internal evaluation of the CSDE to assist in strategic planning for the 2006-2011 State Plan due to the State Board of Education in January 2006. The two Associate Commissioners of the CSDE addressed the EAP at their May meeting to describe the effort and to solicit the EAP's input for critical features to be considered in the evaluation. As a part of the evaluation the Stupski Foundation interviewed the EAP in June 2005 to further assist the Foundation and CSDE in its evaluation.

Superintendent Meeting

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. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen scheduling

issues, the meeting was postponed and was later held in October 2004 following the daylong statewide inclusion conference, Expanding Horizons.

During this session the Commissioner of Education was joined by the Superintendent of Farmington (which had been a spotlight district during 2003-04) and the Superintendent of Enfield (one of the original eight districts identified for ID focused monitoring) with each speaking of their commitment and leadership to including students with disabilities, including students with ID, in their schools and in regular classes with their non-disabled peers. The Commissioner was also joined by the EAP and the directors of special education from the two districts to address the audience. Dialogue was facilitated with the more than 150 superintendents, associate superintendents for curriculum and instruction, directors of special education, Deans and faculty of institutions of higher education; SERC consultants; CSDE management and consultants; parent organization representatives; plaintiff organization representatives and other interested parties in attendance.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

As indicated in the **Third Annual Report**, pg. 114 the University of Connecticut Center for Education Policy Analysis was contracted to conduct an evaluation that addressed several areas of interest to the CSDE. These guiding questions provided the framework for the study conducted during the fall and winter of the 2004-05 school year.

The purpose was to describe and understand the impact of the systems of monitoring, technical assistance and training that have been developed and implemented by the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE) in an effort to achieve the goals of the P.J. et al. v. State of Connecticut, et al. Settlement Agreement. The study used qualitative methods of inquiry to evaluate the impact of the CSDE's interventions on 6 school districts that represented intensive, moderate, and minimal levels of intervention from the CSDE. These districts were also selected to reflect strong and weak data on the goals of the Settlement Agreement and multiple Educational Reference Groups (ERG).

Evaluators conducted focused case studies asking targeted questions. Two evaluators spent 2 days each in a sample of six districts, collecting data through observations of relevant classrooms, individual interviews with selected key players (superintendent, building principals, special education director, related service personnel, parents) and group interviews of general and special education teachers and parents.

The evaluation addressed the following objectives:

1. To describe what CSDE is doing in the state interventions with districts;
2. To collect evidence that districts are using the tools provided through the three interventions;
3. To collect evidence that students with intellectual disability are engaging and participating in inclusive settings;
4. To describe the quality of service delivery in inclusive sites and across state;

5. To determine the perceived factors that contribute to what works and what does not;
6. To explore what districts are doing systematically that will lead to institutional change;
7. To make preliminary recommendations for on-going evaluation and sustainability etc.

While the researchers anticipate providing the CSDE with a more comprehensive executive summary of findings during the summer of 2005 below are general findings:

- Training and technical assistance are most effective if the district is able to integrate it with other initiatives (e.g. NCLB);
- T and TA are effective if districts find a way to adapt and tailor it to their specific needs, individualize to teachers and their specific classroom contexts and make connections to individual students;
- Schools are more successful if they consistently provide opportunities (time) for planning and collaboration;
- An important element for success is to take into account and validating people's concerns and worries when promoting and enforcing change;
- When districts are targeted, they recognize that this will get them more help and involvement from the CSDE;
- Successful (e.g. "High Capacity) districts are internally accountable as well as accountable to the state; "Low capacity" districts are more concerned with external accountability and "targets";
- In places where quality inclusive practices are working, there is evidence of buy-in from leadership across all relevant stakeholders (Teachers, administrators, parents and community); and
- In districts that were more inclusive, administration tended to have both general education and special education experience and training.

The CSDE anticipates utilizing the results of this evaluation to discuss the possible development of a quantitative study that would investigate the impact on district outcomes of the variables identified through this study.

ACTIVITIES 2005-06

The following areas of activities for 2005-06 include:

- Monitoring and Assistance-LRE
- Monitoring and Assistance- Disparate identification
- Data
- Training and Technical Assistance
- High School and Young Adults
- EAP
- Parents Activities
- Others

Monitoring and Assistance

During the 2005-06 school year the CSDE will be conducting statewide focused monitoring in the areas of LRE and Overrepresentation. The CSDE will conduct follow up improvement planning sessions for each district to create improvement plans. Each district will be provided with CSDE technical assistance and oversight monitoring of implementation for 18 months. SERC technical assistance will be available to the district to assist in implementation of the improvement plan.

The following incentives and sanctions may be utilized with districts, including those districts being monitored due to the Settlement Agreement.

Incentives:

- Letter of commendation/acknowledgement to superintendent and/or local board of education from the commissioner or associate commissioner of education;
- Commendation on the CSDE's website;
- Identification as a spotlight district; and/or
- Allocation of discretionary grant funds for replication of commended strategies.

Sanctions:

- Review of progress on the district improvement plan on a quarterly basis. All district's data will be publicly displayed on the CSDE's website.
- At the end of pre-specified period of time, notification to superintendent regarding lack of progress on improvement plan. Redesign improvement plan with more direction from the CSDE. Presentation of improvement plan to the local board of education. Local board may be required to hold a public hearing to present the improvement plan.
- Release of IDEA funds on a conditional basis or direct IDEA funds to address strategies in the improvement plan.
- Appoint a special education consultant to assist with implementation of the improvement plan at district expense

Monitoring and Assistance -LRE

During the upcoming 2005-06 school year, the CSDE will be conducting LRE monitoring that will encompass several tiers of intervention:

A summative review by the CSDE will occur in July 2005 and will include analysis of each districts December 2002 to June 2005 data submission which should reflect student IEPs for the fall 2005, each district's self-assessment, each district's formative evaluation report, and CSDE consultant's knowledge of district actions and efforts during the 2004-05 school year. A written report will be provided to the Superintendent of each district. The CSDE expects this summative evaluation to assist the districts in their development of an appropriate response plan, to be completed by September 2005. Specific interventions by the CSDE as a result of these summative evaluations may include incentives and sanctions are described in the **Synopsis** of this report.

In January 2006 a mid-year formative evaluation (intended to provide feedback for determination of next steps) will be conducted by the CSDE to review the districts' December 2005 data and accomplishments to date on their plans. Specific interventions

as a result of these formative evaluations may be similar to those used for the summative evaluation.

In June 2006 districts will submit an end of the year self-assessment that will assist the CSDE in a July 2006 summative evaluation, similar to that described above for July 2005.

The CSDE will again focus on LRE as a statewide focused monitoring initiative. Two (2) RESCs and six (6) districts will be selected for review utilizing the system of selection and monitoring described in section MONITORING, pg. 59 and Appendix 6.

Monitoring and Assistance-Disparate Identification

Prior to the beginning of the 2005-06 school year, districts will receive statewide maps which indicate by color coding, the significance of the district's overrepresentation using 2003-04 data for all disability categories. Additionally, all districts will receive a district composition profile indicating areas of significant overrepresentation as compared to the white population in their district. A third data report indicating suspension and expulsion data for 2003-04 will be sent to every district for review.

From these three data sources, the CSDE has selected four districts for focused monitoring during 2005-06, two of which include ID overrepresentation (New Britain and Stamford). These districts will receive focused monitoring similarly to monitoring conducted during 2004-05 (see section MONITORING, pg. 56).

The CSDE has recently reviewed the 2003-04 data for overrepresentation, including students with an ID and will be directing Norwalk and Windham to use 15% of their IDEA funds for 2005-06 for early intervening services. Both of these districts received focused monitoring during 2004-05 based on 2002-03 data. As their ID odds ratio data and other disability area data remained the same or worsened from the 2002-03 to 2003-04 data, these districts were targeted for this use of funds requirement.

Additional districts that have one or more areas of significant overrepresentation will be invited to participate in Summit IV activities. Summit IV will be developed in collaboration with the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCREST). Connecticut was one of nine states that received a grant in August, 2004 from the NCRESST and is working with Connecticut by providing technical assistance and information on best practices from the research on reducing disproportionality.

Additionally the CSDE will be revising the identification guidelines for Intellectual Disability and Learning Disability. Additionally, guidance will be provided on the identification of Multiple Disabilities. Training will be developed to accompany the ID guidelines.

Data

Data Accuracy Auditing:

The CSDE will replicate monitoring procedures employed in the Spring 2003 to determine if reporting errors have diminished. Additionally, auditing of March 2005 to June 2005 ID classification changes will be audited for errors.

Guidance on data accuracy will be provided to districts to assist in reducing errors. Other data accuracy activities will continue as described in DATA ACCURACY, pg. 52

Data Analysis

At the recommendation of the EAP the CSDE will disaggregate students that change eligibility category from ID to another category by age (groupings/or building levels – elem, middle, high). This will be available for the September EAP agenda item re: “High School experience”.

Data Collection

Beginning for the 2005-06 school year, additional districts are being considered for a three times per year submission of data, similar to the submissions required of the

twenty-four districts. The twenty-four districts will continue to provide data tri-annually (3X/year).

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 2004-05 (Appendix 1); COACHES ACADEMY, pg. 91; IMMEDIATE STUDENT RESPONSE TEAM, pg. 93; and TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM, pg. 78.

High School and Young Adults

For the September EAP meeting the CSDE will be prepared to discuss the "high school experience" as recommended by the EAP, and the status of the CSDE's collaboration with multiple agencies stemming from the EAP's recommendations for interagency collaboration in service delivery for the 18-21 year old population.

A best practice document on transition for students with intellectual disabilities is being written for dissemination in the fall 2005. This document is framed by the contents of the CSDE's **Connecticut's Transition Training Manual and Resource Directory**. Using this document as an outline, examples of best practice for students with an ID will be incorporated into the text.

EAP

The EAP plans to meet three times during the 2005-06 school year in Hartford as stipulated by the Settlement Agreement and other settings as deemed necessary. These dates include September 21-23, 2005; January 18-20, 2006; and May 10-12, 2006. These dates will include site visits by EAP members to local districts and a public forum for the EAP to listen to and interact with the public at their discretion.

By September 1, 2005 the EAP will submit its third written report to the Court, Plaintiffs and CSED.

During the September meeting of the EAP the CSDE will be addressing the EAP proposed agenda that includes:

- A review of teacher union contracts as a facilitator/barrier to implementing PJ;
- Paraprofessional contracts as a facilitator/barrier to implementing PJ
- The High School Experience (and effective transition)
- Visitations and meetings with school districts

Parents Activities

The Settlement Agreement requires the CSDE in collaboration with CPAC to provide parent training through June 30, 2005. Representatives of the LRE sub-committee will be meeting with George Dowaliby and Deborah Richards on June 29, 2005 to discuss priorities and plans for future parent training. The CSDE fully anticipates that the Parent Work Group will continue to advise the CSDE in efforts designed to inform and train parents to participate in their child's educational program.

In addition, the following initiatives to support parent training have been planned for next year:

- Completion of the district training for Families as Partners SIG Grant;
- Review of Families as Partners evaluation by the Parent Work Group;
- Conduct of a train the trainers session for all LEAs on the Families as Partners modules;
- Review of the Parent Survey results by the Parent Work Group;
- In collaboration with CCIE and CT ARC, conduct of sessions at Expanding Horizons Conference;
- Continuation of 1:1 support for families through local parent organizations;

- Training for LEAs on how to conduct effective parent training on the Settlement Agreement and LRE;
- Continued distribution of the Parent Resource Brochure;
- Revision and dissemination of the Parent's Guide to Special Education in Connecticut;
- Conduct of public forums during EAP meetings;
- Review of requests for funding of state wide conferences for families and award as deemed appropriate;
- Conduct of parent forums in all districts that are monitored for LRE; and
- Ongoing communication with class members.

Superintendent Group

A recommendation of the EAP in October 2004 was for CSDE to convene a Superintendent's task force to examine the revision of the LRE Guiding principles. This is planned for the 2005-06 school year.

Contracts and Unions

In collaboration with the Connecticut Education Association (CEA) the CSDE will be developing joint activities and written guidance to union members. During the summer of 2005 Dr. Freagon of the EAP will be reviewing teacher and paraprofessional contracts from the twenty-four districts to assist in framing a discussion during 2005-06 on contracts.

Quantitative Study

The CSDE anticipates utilizing the results of the qualitative study conducted by the Center for Education Policy Analysis to discuss the possible development of a quantitative study that would investigate the impact on district outcomes of the variables identified through this study.

Policy Documents

The EAP has recommended that a review of state policies be discussed again at an upcoming EAP meeting for 2005-06. This will be added to an EAP agenda.

INDEX OF TABLES

Table	Page of Annual Report	Title of Table
1	ii	Table 1- EAP Recommended Groupings
2	ii	Table 2- All Connecticut Districts Grouped by EAP Suggested Cutpoints for Percent Placed in Regular Class
3	iv	Table 3-All Connecticut Districts Grouped by EAP Suggested Cutpoints for Percent Attending Home School
4	vi	Table 4- Districts with Overrepresentation by Race/Ethnicity of 2003-04 Data that is Statistically Significant and/or has High Odds Ratios Grouped by CSDE Cutpoints
5	5	Table 5-State Goals 1, 3, 4, and 5 from 1998-2004
6	6	Table 6- State Goal 2-Incidence Rate from 1998-2004
7	7	Table 7- State Goal 2-Male Gender Rate from 1998-2004
8	8	Table 8- State Goal 2 Race/Ethnicity Rate from 1998-2004
9	8	Table 9- State Goal 2 Race/Ethnicity <u>Difference in Race/Ethnic Proportions</u> Between State and ID from 1998-2004 for Overrepresented Groups (2004-2005 Data are Preliminary)
10	11	Table 10-Data for Districts with 20 or more students with ID, not including the 24 IDFM Districts

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
11	17	Table 11-Eight (8) IDFM Districts
12	21	Table 12-Sixteen (16) IDFM Districts
13	32	Table 13-Extracurricular Participation among Connecticut's 13-16 year old students w/ID/MR
14	34	Table 14-Out of District Placement and Placing Party of Students w ID/MR 2003-04 and Preliminary 2004-05 Data
15	36	Table 15-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: 2003-2004 Data and Preliminary 2004-05 Data
16	38	Table 16- State Goal 2-Incidence Rate from 1998-2004
17	44	Table 17-Districts Identified with significant Disproportionate Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group for MR/ID (N \geq 20), 2001-02 Reporting Year, 2002-03 Reporting Year, 2003-04 Reporting Year
18	46	Table 18- Districts Identified with significant Disproportionate Representation of Males as MR/ID, 2002-03 Reporting Year, 2003-04 Reporting Year, 2004-05 Reporting Year
19	60	Table 19-Fully Adjudicated Impartial Due Process Hearing Results
20	70	Table 20- Audit Findings of Files reviewed-Changes from March to June 2004 from ID to another disability category
21	72	Table 21- Audit/Monitoring Findings of Files reviewed-Changes from December 2003 to December 2004 from ID to LD or MD category

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
22	95	Table 22-Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings, including those w/Mediation Requests
23	96	Table 23-Issues of Requests for Impartial Due Process Hearings
24	96	Table 24-Districts having requests for Impartial Due Process Hearing
25	97	Table 25-Requests for Mediation
26	97	Table 26-Issues of Mediation
27	98	Table 27-Districts having requests for Mediation
28	109	Table 28-EAP Report to the Court-September 30, 2004
29	114	Table 29-EAP Meeting Recommendations for 2004-05-October, January and May

**INDEX OF
 DATA APPENDICES**

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
A	1, 51	1998-2004 goal #1 data table Percent of CT K-12 ID/MR Students spending 79-100% of their Time With Non-Disabled Peers
B	1, 51	1998-2004 goal #2 Identification of CT K-12 ID/MR Students by Race/Ethnicity, Prevalence and Gender
C	1, 51	1998-2004 goal #3 Mean and Median Amount of Time CT K-12 ID/MR Students spend With Non-Disabled Peers
D	1, 51	2001-2004 goal # 4 Home School Enrollment for CT K-12 ID/MR Students
E	1, 51	2001-2004 goal #5 Extra Curricular Participation by CT K-12 ID/MR Students
F	1, 51	1998-2004 Pre- K Data on all five outcomes
G	1, 4	1998-2004 List of Class Members
H	15	2004-05 Districts \leq 19 students with ID above and below State figures on all LRE outcomes

**INDEX OF
OTHER APPENDICES
BY NUMBER**

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
1.	3, 48, 78, 87, 133	<u>A Report of SERC’s Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2004-05</u>
2.	9	Disparate Identification-Race/Ethnicity Composition Index- CT
3.	16, 62, 64	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts and State Data with Districts’ Self-Assessments-June 2005
4.	39	EAP Report- September 30, 2004
5.	56	Disparate Identification – color-coded statewide maps
6.	vi, v, 57, 59, 60	Focused Monitoring Manual-CONNECTICUT’S SYSTEM OF GENERAL SUPERVISION AND FOCUSED MONITORING for Continuous Improvement for Students with Disabilities
7.	57	Disparate Identification – Monitoring Tools
8.	58	Disparate Identification – Monitoring Reports and Data
9.	58	Improvement Plan format
10.	59	LRE-Color-coded Statewide Maps
11.	60	LRE- Monitoring Tools
12.	60	LRE-Focused Monitoring Letters
13.	60	LRE- Focused Monitoring Reports

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
14.	61	Electronic Whiteboard Teleconference
15.	61	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Summative Evaluation Reports- July 2004
16.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Midyear Report Format
17.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Participatory Evaluation Training
18.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Participatory Evaluation Technical Assistance
19.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Formative Evaluation Tools
20.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Midyear Reports-January 2005
21.	63, 64, 111	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Formative Evaluation Reports-February 2005
22.	64	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Self- Assessment End-of-Year Evaluation format
23.	65	Seven (7) districts targeted for support-2004- 05 letter
24.	66	Low Incidence/Rural District Training letter
25.	66	Low Incidence/Rural District Survey Results- December 2004
26.	71	Monitoring- Audit Results for Changes from ID to LD or MD
27.	73, 117	Monitoring- Audit Tools for File Reviews- Exits of 18-21 year olds

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
28.	73	Monitoring- Audit Tools for Phone Survey- Exits of 18-21 year olds
29.	73	Monitoring- File Reviews Results for Exits of 18-21 year olds
30.	73	Monitoring- Phone Survey Results for Exits of 18-21 year olds
31.	75	Monitoring- TWNDP Reduction Audit letter
32.	76	Monitoring- TWNDP Reduction Audit letter for Step 2
33.	76	Monitoring- TWNDP Reduction Audit- Case Conference Questions
34.	79	Educational Benefit Training
35.	83, 114	Cultural Responsiveness Survey- PEACE Associates
36.	86, 121	SERC LRE/Inclusion Booklet 2004-05
37.	87, 113	RESOURCE DIRECTORY OF SPECIALISTS: Educating Students with an Intellectual Disability in General Education Environments
38.	91, 94	Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team RFP
39.	91	EAP Report-January 30, 2004
40.	91	Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team Bidder's Conference
41.	92	Coaches Academy Curriculum Development Consortium

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
42.	92	Coaches Academy Competencies
43.	99	Parent – LEA Data Base Mailing
44.	100, 121	Parent – Mailings: 2004-05
45.	101	Parent– Organization Meetings and Contacts 2004-05
46.	101	Parent – Survey 2004-05
47.	101	Parent – Resource Brochure
48.	103, 106	Parent – Training 2004-05
49.	105	Parent – LEA Training Survey
50.	106, 107	Parent – SIG Families as Partners Training
51.	108	EAP Public Forums
52.	109	ID Focused Monitoring Action Plan RFP
53.	116	ID Guidelines Meeting
54.	117, 120	High School Graduation Guidance
55.	117	All Disability Exiter Survey Executive Summary- December 2004
56.	120	TWNDP-Data Guidance
57.	123, 124	CSDE Department-wide Sessions
58.	124	Stupski Foundation

**INDEX OF
OTHER APPENDICES
BY
TITLE-ALPHABETICAL**

Appendix	Page of Annual Report	Title of Document
1.	3, 48, 78, 87, 133	<u>A Report of SERC’s Technical Assistance and Professional Development 2004-05</u>
55.	117	All Disability Exiter Survey Executive Summary- December 2004
40.	91	Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team Bidder’s Conference
38.	91, 94	Coaches Academy and Immediate Student Response Team RFP
42.	92	Coaches Academy Competencies
41.	92	Coaches Academy Curriculum Development Consortium
57.	123, 124	CSDE Department-wide Sessions
35.	83, 114	Cultural Responsiveness Survey- PEACE Associates
5.	56	Disparate Identification – color-coded statewide maps
8.	58	Disparate Identification – Monitoring Reports and Data
7.	57	Disparate Identification – Monitoring Tools
2.	9	Disparate Identification-Race/Ethnicity Composition Index- CT
51.	108	EAP Public Forums

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
4.	39	EAP Report- September 30, 2004
39.	91	EAP Report-January 30, 2004
34.	79	Educational Benefit Training
14.	61	Electronic Whiteboard Teleconference
6.	vi, v, 57, 59, 60	Focused Monitoring Manual-CONNECTICUT'S SYSTEM OF GENERAL SUPERVISION AND FOCUSED MONITORING for Continuous Improvement for Students with Disabilities
54.	117, 120	High School Graduation Guidance
3.	16, 62, 64	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts and State Data with Districts' Self-Assessments-June 2005
16.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts- Midyear Report Format
15.	61	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Summative Evaluation Reports- July 2004
21.	63, 64, 111	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Formative Evaluation Reports-February 2005
19.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Formative Evaluation Tools
20.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Midyear Reports-January 2005
18.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Participatory Evaluation Technical Assistance
17.	63	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Participatory Evaluation Training

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
22.	64	ID Focused Monitoring 24 Districts-Self-Assessment End-of-Year Evaluation format
52.	109	ID Focused Monitoring Action Plan RFP
53.	116	ID Guidelines Meeting
9.	58	Improvement Plan format
25.	66	Low Incidence/Rural District Survey Results-December 2004
24.	66	Low Incidence/Rural District Training letter
13.	60	LRE- Focused Monitoring Reports
11.	60	LRE- Monitoring Tools
10.	59	LRE-Color-coded Statewide Maps
12.	60	LRE-Focused Monitoring Letters
26.	71	Monitoring- Audit Results for Changes from ID to LD or MD
27.	73, 117	Monitoring- Audit Tools for File Reviews- Exits of 18-21 year olds
28.	73	Monitoring- Audit Tools for Phone Survey- Exits of 18-21 year olds
29.	73	Monitoring- File Reviews Results for Exits of 18-21 year olds
30.	73	Monitoring- Phone Survey Results for Exits of 18-21 year olds
33.	76	Monitoring- TWNDP Reduction Audit- Case Conference Questions

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT- JUNE 30, 2005
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
31.	75	Monitoring- TWNDP Reduction Audit letter
32.	76	Monitoring- TWNDP Reduction Audit letter for Step 2
43.	99	Parent – LEA Data Base Mailing
49.	105	Parent – LEA Training Survey
44.	100, 121	Parent – Mailings: 2004-05
45.	101	Parent – Organization Meetings and Contacts 2004-05
47.	101	Parent – Resource Brochure
50.	106, 107	Parent – SIG Families as Partners Training
46	101	Parent – Survey 2004-05
48.	103, 106	Parent – Training 2004-05
37.	87, 113	RESOURCE DIRECTORY OF SPECIALISTS: Educating Students with an Intellectual Disability in General Education Environments
36.	86, 121	SERC LRE/Inclusion Booklet 2004-05
23.	65	Seven (7) districts targeted for support-2004-05 letter
58.	124	Stupski Foundation
56.	120	TWNDP-Data Guidance