

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 63%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 57.4%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. In its narrative, the State explained that graduation requirements are made at the local level and did not address if the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma are different than for youth without an IEP.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.8%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 39.5%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the 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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 17.39%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 12.68%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 27%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97% for reading and 97.5% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 100%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.  <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/csap/csap_summary.html">http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/csap/csap_summary.html</a></p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 55.7% for reading and 48.4% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 58.5% for reading and 53% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.  <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/csap/csap_summary.html">http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/csap/csap_summary.html</a></p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. Because the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>expulsion:  A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and  [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5%.  The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:  B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.  [Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:  A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;  B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or  C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<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 2009 APR.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
placements. [Results Indicator]		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	
	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63.1	67.7	70.9	4.6	
	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.8	10.0	7.5	1.8	
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.2	3.5	3.9	.7	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B.					
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.					The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.
7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of	The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.					The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>												
<p>knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 282 1444 808"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 282 919 396">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 282 1192 396"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1192 282 1444 396"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 396 919 534"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 396 1192 534">77.3</td> <td data-bbox="1192 396 1444 534">76.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 534 919 704"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 534 1192 704">75.8</td> <td data-bbox="1192 534 1444 704">71.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 704 919 808"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 704 1192 808">75.5</td> <td data-bbox="1192 704 1444 808">74.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	77.3	76.1	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	75.8	71.0	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.5	74.0	
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>												
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	77.3	76.1												
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	75.8	71.0												
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.5	74.0												
<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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 45.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 31.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 55%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing, in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100%</p>												

<sup>1</sup> Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

<sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in January 2009 based on FFY 2006 data for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 3.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported that it made findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data. Although the State was not required to report on the correction of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2009, the State provided information on correction. The State reported that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. The State further reported that it has not verified that the two districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing, in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 92.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) .</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98%. The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR; therefore, OSEP cannot determine if there was progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported data that was not valid and reliable for this indicator for FFY 2007, the data provided indicated that the compliance rate was below 100%. The State did not provide information on any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010 valid and reliable indicator data that is reflective of the measurement. The State provided valid and reliable data.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of intervention for three consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005, 2006 and 2007 APRs, and was required to submit a corrective action plan (CAP) by July 31, 2009. The State submitted the required CAP on July 30, 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must also report, in the FFY 2009 APR, on why it did not make findings based on the FFY 2007 data that the State reported under this indicator, given that the FFY 2007 data reflected noncompliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 17 of 39 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that 19 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that all five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>to verify the correction.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 82.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 81.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 166 of 201 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and 29 were subsequently corrected. For the remaining six findings of noncompliance that were not corrected, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 17 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005</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 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2008 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and the one finding in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR, were corrected.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>were corrected.</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 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>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 45.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 54.55%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 57.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 79.16%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 72%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.62%. However, OSEP's calculation for this indicator is 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 82.2%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		20 Data Rubric.