

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 62.93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 58.1%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 55%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 31.65%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 32.64%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 39.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 12.68%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 23%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 25%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100% for reading and 100% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100% for reading and remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 99.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 57.3% for reading and 50.6% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 56.9% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 51.7% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 58% for reading and 52.5% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008), and a description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), for the Administrative Units (AUs) identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State also provided the results of its examination of data from FFY 2007. The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected AUs to revise), the AU's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the AUs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and 2006. The</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	State did not make any findings of noncompliance as a result of these reviews.																					
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1467 1352"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>59.7</td> <td>63.1</td> <td>70.7</td> <td>3.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>11.2</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>7.6</td> <td>0.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>-0.60%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	59.7	63.1	70.7	3.40%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.2	11.8	7.6	0.60%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.8	4.2	4.0	-0.60%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	59.7	63.1	70.7	3.40%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.2	11.8	7.6	0.60%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.8	4.2	4.0	-0.60%																		

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 683 1419 1445"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 683 1050 857">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1050 683 1180 857">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 683 1299 857">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 683 1419 857">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 857 1050 927">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 857 1180 927">3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 857 1299 927">2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 857 1419 927">1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 927 1050 1062">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 927 1180 1062">1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 927 1299 1062">2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 927 1419 1062">2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1062 1050 1162">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1062 1180 1162">3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1062 1299 1162">2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1062 1419 1162">2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1162 1050 1263">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1162 1180 1263">16%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1162 1299 1263">17%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1162 1419 1263">14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1263 1050 1364">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1263 1180 1364">77%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1263 1299 1364">77%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1263 1419 1364">80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1364 1050 1445">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1050 1364 1180 1445">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1364 1299 1445">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1364 1419 1445">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3%	2%	1%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1%	2%	2%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	3%	2%	2%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	16%	17%	14%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	77%	77%	80%	Total (approx. 100%)	100%	100%	100%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3%	2%	1%																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1%	2%	2%																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	3%	2%	2%																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	16%	17%	14%																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	77%	77%	80%																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100%	100%	100%																											

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 31.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 41.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 50%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of the State's population. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.7%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of AUs determined in FFY 2007 (zero), FFY 2006 (one) and FFY 2005 (zero) to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) valid and reliable data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006; and 2) its determinations of whether the AUs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. <p>The State provided the required information.</p> <p>With respect to FFY 2006, the State reported that it identified one AU with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. However, the State did not make the finding until January</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that, in January 2009, it identified noncompliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 based on FFY 2006 data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it verified that the AU with noncompliance based on FFY 2006 data: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>2009.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of AUs determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) valid and reliable data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006; and 2) its determinations of whether the AUs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. <p>The State provided the required information and reported that no AUs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories resulting from inappropriate identification for FFY 2005 and 2006.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, a report on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006. The State reported that two out of five AUs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it issued a “Sanction 1 letter” to the AU’s Board of Directors.</p>	<p>2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR for FFY 2006 and FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each AU with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.7%. However, these data are not valid and reliable because they do not meet the measurement. The State reported that it does not collect data on the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed <u>and implemented</u> by their third birthdays. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 a report on the correction</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data beginning with the FFY 2008 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>Although the State’s FFY 2007 data is not</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006. The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>valid and reliable, the State was able to identify noncompliance based on that data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each AU with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 34.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 a report on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, and</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that nine of 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and one subsequently was corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it issued a “Sanction 1 letter” to the AUs’ Board of Directors.</p>	<p>the correction of the noncompliance from FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each AU with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 84.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 44.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 56%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 81.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 19.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table and May 9, 2008 verification letter required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Updated data and information on the status of correction for one AU that had been found out of compliance with the districtwide 	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must also review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>assessment requirements of 34 CFR §300.160;</p> <p>2) The removal of the 95% compliance rate threshold for determining AU compliance;</p> <p>3) The compliance status of the two AUs who received sanctions from CDE in July and November 2005; and</p> <p>4) Data indicating that the State is timely correcting noncompliance.</p> <p>The State provided information indicating that the AU that had been out of compliance with the districtwide assessment requirements under 34 CFR §300.160 corrected the noncompliance, and also reported that it removed the 95% compliance rate threshold for determining AU compliance. With respect to the two AUs who received sanctions from CDE in July and November 2005, the State reported that one AU corrected the noncompliance and that the other AU has not yet corrected the noncompliance. For the latter, the State reported that it provides ongoing technical assistance and will enforce additional sanctions if the AU continues to demonstrate noncompliance.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance from 2005, the State reported that it issued a “Sanction 1 letter” to the AU’s Board of Directors.</p>	<p>the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State’s monitoring system, through the State’s data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each AU with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92.86%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 54.55%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 42.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 79.16%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 81.8%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 66%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 82.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 79.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>