

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State did not provide targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 64.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 63%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 59.5%.</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).</p>	<p>With the FFY 2010 APR, the State must submit a revised SPP with targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 2.8%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 39%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 13.64%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 17.39%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 28%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.04% for reading and 97.27% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97% for</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>
[Results Indicator]	<p>reading and remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 97.5% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 100%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 54.07% for reading and 47.63% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 55.7% for reading and remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 48.4% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 59% for reading and 53.5% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 3.45%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 4%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 3.45%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1,</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that 14 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that two districts were identified as having 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.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs' 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance though this review.</p> <p>The State reported a minimum "n" size requirement of ten students with IEPs suspended/expelled for greater than ten days in a school year, regardless of race or ethnicity, and when disaggregated by race or ethnicity, the percentage of disciplinary removals must be equal to or greater than 10% of the percentage of students eligible for special education services by race or ethnicity, and that all AUs were included in the calculation for this indicator.</p>	<p>2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (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 2010 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>requirements in the FFY 2010 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 methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 881 1583 1325"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">63.1</td> <td align="center">70.02</td> <td align="center">71.1</td> <td align="center">6.92%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">11.8</td> <td align="center">9.2</td> <td align="center">7.4</td> <td align="center">2.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">4.2</td> <td align="center">3.1</td> <td align="center">3.8</td> <td align="center">1.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target for Indicator 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for Indicators 5A and 5B.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	% Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63.1	70.02	71.1	6.92%	% Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.8	9.2	7.4	2.60%	% In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.2	3.1	3.8	1.10%	<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 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
% Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	63.1	70.02	71.1	6.92%																		
% Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.8	9.2	7.4	2.60%																		
% In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.2	3.1	3.8	1.10%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010</p>																				

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1583 1479"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 829 957 932"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 829 1163 932"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 829 1373 932"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 829 1583 932"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 932 957 1117"> <p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p> </td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 932 1163 1117">77.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 932 1373 1117">83.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 932 1583 1117">77.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1117 957 1333"> <p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p> </td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1117 1163 1333">75.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1117 1373 1333">75.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1117 1583 1333">76.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1333 957 1479"> <p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p> </td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1333 1163 1479">75.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1333 1373 1479">79.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1333 1583 1479">76.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	77.3	83.1	77.8	<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	75.8	75.7	76.3	<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	75.5	79.8	76.0	<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 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>															
<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	77.3	83.1	77.8															
<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	75.8	75.7	76.3															
<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	75.5	79.8	76.0															

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	76.1	84.3	76.6	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	71.0	73.5	71.5	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	74.0	84.2	74.5	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 51.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 45.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 60% for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.7%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that five districts of 58 were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were 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 provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that it has a State-established minimum "n" size of 30 students in a race/ethnicity category and all AUs were included in the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 3.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 58 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that it established a minimum "n" size of 30 students in a race/ethnicity category and that all AUs were included in the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (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 2010 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2009 and the district identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008. The State reported that it made eight findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data in FFY 2009, during March 2010. The State also reported that seven of eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data were corrected and that the State will report on the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEA with the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data: (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</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008. The State reported that it made two findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data in FFY 2009, during March 2010. The State also reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data was already corrected and that the State will report on the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to include in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, information 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. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>data is corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and the LEA with the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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,</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 83.9%.</p> <p>The State reported that the three remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>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>2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1,</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>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>were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 31.1% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 56.2% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 60.2% 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>2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 92.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 82.6%.</p> <p>The State reported that 47 of 51 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that two findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected. 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 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 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>In reporting on correction of</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4B, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State is in</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that five of eight resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet targets or provide improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 63.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 57.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2009 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>
	of 75%.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.62%. The State met its FFY 2009 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>