A UNIVERSE OF OPPORTUNITIES

CONNECTICUT Education

2024-2025

Special Education Committee 02-24-25

> Ajit Gopalakrishnan Chief Performance Officer

Bryan Klimkiewicz Bureau of Special Education Connecticut State Department of Education



Bureau of Special Education



Bureau of Special Education Division Director: Bryan Klimkiewicz Bureau Chief: Katheryn Matz*							
Administrative Assistant: Mildred Pagan							
Bureau Units	1: Due Process	2: Program Improvement	3: Grants, Funding & Communications				
Support Staff	Jolie Medina	Vacant	Regina Gaunichaux				
Consultants	Sean Cronin Kirsten Dovenberg Jennifer James Natalie Jones Georgette Nemr	Bridget Adams Nicole Deal Laura Luna Dori Papa Viviana Toure Mike Tavernier	Jay Brown Ashley DiGangi Renee Kleinman Alexa Osterhout Alycia Trakas Vacant				
Activities	Conflict Resolution, Compliance, Equity	General Monitoring & Supervision	Resource Allocation & Communications				
Strategies	Building Partnership Structures	Differentiated Monitoring & Support (State Performance Plan)	Accessible Resources				
CT-SEDS Durational Project Manager: Kim Bean							
General Monitoring and Supervision DPM: Heather Levitt-Doucette							
Improved Student Outcomes							

1: Dispute Resolution Unit (Building Collaborative Partnerships) *Special Education Leadership *Student (Voice, Independence, Self-Advocacy) *Parents/Families *Advocates/Attorneys 2: Program Improvement (General Monitoring and Supervision) *State Performance Plan (17 Indicators) *Compliance/Results *Differentiated Risk Assessment *Technical Assistance

3: Guidance, Funding, and Communications

- *Grant Management
- *Guidance Documents
- *Professional Development

*<u>start</u> date 4/4/2025







The CSDE envisions a high-quality, integrated system of General Supervision for the provision of special education and related services in Connecticut, resulting in positive outcomes for students with disabilities.

Through a robust system of support and shared accountability our goal is to improve students' educational outcomes, empower educators and parents, and promote an inclusive educational system that prepares all students to thrive academically, socially, and personally.







FAPE A Free and Appropriate Public Education



LRE Least Restrictive Environment





Individualization



• **Special Education:** "specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs if a child with a disability including instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions and in other settings."

• Unique needs of the child

- Individually designed evaluation/assessment to identify the child's educational needs
- Evaluation/assessment designed by the child's planning and placement team (PPT)
- Individualized specially designed instruction
 - Developed by the child's PPT
 - Based upon the child's individualized goals and objectives
 - Written on an individualized education program (IEP)
 - IEP describes the services, personnel, frequency, intensity
 - Based upon the general education curriculum and high expectations
 - Includes transition planning to post-secondary education, vocation, and independent living skills (if necessary)



Part C to Part B Transition





- 1. Has a disability
- 2. Adverse Effect
- 3. Requires Specially

Designed Instruction









Prevalence Rates (K-12)







Least Restrictive Environment



Trend







% of SWD with 80-100% TWNDP by Disability

 $0.00\% \quad 10.00\% \quad 20.00\% \quad 30.00\% \quad 40.00\% \quad 50.00\% \quad 60.00\% \quad 70.00\% \quad 80.00\% \quad 90.00\% \quad 100.00\%$





Least Restrictive Environment



0.00% 5.00% 10.00% 15.00% 20.00% 25.00% 30.00% 1.41% LD 1.05% 27.28% ID 7.77% 12.96% ED 24.74% 1.94% SLI 0.37% 22.23% Other 13.03% 4.85% OHI 5.65% 21.07% Autism 11.16% 7.93% Total 5.81%

% of SWD in Segregated Settings by Disability

0-40% TWNDP Separate Setting



- Governed by Connecticut General Statutes 10-76g.
- Reimburses districts for high-cost special education students for costs that exceed 4.5 times the district's Net Current Expenditures per Pupil (NCEP) from the prior year.
- Example:
 - NCEP for District A is \$20,000.
 - Two special education students at District A have very high costs.
 - Student 1 costs \$120,000 and Student 2 costs \$140,000.
 - 4.5 times NCEP = 4.5 x 20,000 = \$90,000.
 - District A can apply to seek reimbursement for total excess costs of \$80,000: \$30,000 for Student 1 and \$50,000 for Student 2.



Special Education Excess Cost Grant

- This grant is a capped, entitlement grant.
- *Entitlement* meaning that the district does not need to submit a traditional grant "application" to receive the funds.
- Capped meaning that the legislature allocates a fixed amount or appropriation annually, so if the request from all districts exceeds that appropriation, then the entitlements for all district will need to be reduced by law to stay within the appropriation.
- By law, districts seeking reimbursement must submit student and expenditure data twice during the year, initially by December 1, and the final by March 1.
- By law, 75% of the preliminary capped award is paid in February and the balance is paid in May of the year.



Proportional Reduction by Law Prior to 2022-23



- If total district requests exceeds the available appropriation, then all districts are reduced proportionally.
- Example:
 - Total appropriation: \$900,000.
 - Total request from districts: \$1,250,000.
 - Requests exceed appropriation by: \$350,000
 - Reduce all districts proportionally i.e., $\frac{350,000}{1,250,000} = 28\%.$
 - Every district will receive 72% of their uncapped request.

District	Uncapped Request	Capped Award	
А	\$700,000	\$504,000	
В	\$400,000	\$288,000	
С	\$150,000	\$108,000	
Total	\$1,250,000	\$900,000	



Proportional Reduction by Law 2022-23 onward Subsection (d) of Section 8 of Public Act 23-1



- Establishes three tiers of reimbursement based on wealth ranking of municipality i.e., 91% (for towns ranked 115-169), 88% (for towns ranked 59-114), and 85% (for towns ranked 1-58).
- Law states that if after application of tiers of reimbursement, total request still exceeds the available appropriation, then all districts are to be reduced proportionally.
- Continuing previous example with capped appropriation of \$900,000. Even after application of Tiered Reimbursement, total request of \$1,116,500 exceeds appropriation of \$900,000 by \$216,500.
- So reduce all districts proportionally by $\frac{216,500}{1,116,500} = 19.39\%$

District	Uncapped Request	Reimbursement Tier	Tiered Reimbursement	After Proportional Reduction of 19.39%	Net Reimbursement Percentage
А	\$700,000	91%	\$637,000	\$513,479.62	73.4%
В	\$400,000	88%	\$352,000	\$283,743.84	70.9%
С	\$150,000	85%	\$127,500	\$102,776.53	68.5%
Total	\$1,250,000		\$1,116,500	\$900,000.00	

Comprehensive Special Education Proposal Package







CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Thank you!