Q&A

Question Set 06/11/26

1. What prompted the District to initiate this review at this time, and what specific outcomes would define success for the engagement?

   The district is interested in continuous improvement of its special education programming. A successful engagement would result in commendations and recommendations that help the district continue to meet needs of children and families.

2. Will the selected consultant have access to student-level data, IEP records, staffing allocations, and financial/outplacement data, and in what format?

   Yes. The consultant will enter into a contract with the district that provides access to data and records consistent with FERPA protections and the scope of the review.

3. How many schools, specialized programs, and transition/18–22 programs are expected to be included in site visits and observations?

   The district has 1 Preschool, 5 Elem schools, 2 Middle schools, 1 High School, 1 Transition program. There are intensive programs at all levels. The program review needs to observe all levels and programs, and the specifics of these visits would be developed in the proposal submitted by the organization conducting the review and in collaboration with the district.

4. Does the District have specific concerns regarding LRE placement patterns, outplacement trends, staffing models, or service-delivery consistency that should receive additional emphasis?

   The guiding question asks the organization conducting the review to address, among other things, LRE, services, and alignment to student needs. The purpose of the review is to identify strengths and areas for continued improvement within these areas.

5. What level of benchmarking against peer Connecticut districts is desired?

   The review should incorporate benchmarking with CT data and comparable districts.

6. What stakeholder participation targets are anticipated for family surveys, focus groups, and interviews?

   The review is seeking a very high level of engagement in focus groups and surveys. A survey target is 100% participation.

7. Is the District seeking implementation planning support beyond the final recommendations?

   This is not determined yet. The review should result in prioritized recommendations.

8. How will the District coordinate this review alongside the separate state-led compliance monitoring process to avoid duplication and stakeholder fatigue?

   The district will coordinate efforts to minimize stakeholder fatigue to the greatest extent feasible, while also realizing this is a significant endeavour. The timing of the state review is not yet determined.