

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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 revised the improvement activities through FFY 2012 and baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 revised baseline data for this indicator are 52%. Therefore, OSEP is not comparing the FFY 2010 data to the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 63%.</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>OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012 a revised SPP with targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 revised baseline data for this indicator are 2.3%. Therefore, OSEP is not comparing the FFY 2010 data to FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 2.4%.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 10.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 13.64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 23%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.49% for reading and 97.9% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.04% for reading and 97.27% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 100%.</p> <p>The State provided Web links to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>
with IEPs. [Results Indicator]		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:  C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.  [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 53.88% for reading and 47.2% for math. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 54.07% for reading and 47.63%.for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 57% for reading and 54% for math.  The State provided Web links to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
4. Rates of suspension and 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]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.45%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 4%.  The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy." The State reported that it does not use a minimum "n" size requirement.  The State reported that one administrative unit (AU) was identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.  The State reported that it reviewed 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 district identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.45%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 3.45%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State reported that all AUs met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of: 1. a minimum of 10 students with IEPs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year, regardless of race or ethnicity, <i>and</i> 2. 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.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 AUs 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 AUs 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 AUs’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on 2008 – 2009 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected. In its FFY 2009 APR, the State reported identifying two findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 based on 2008 – 2009 data. The State was required to report on the correction of these two findings of noncompliance in its FFY 2010 APR. However, on page 33 of the FFY 2010 APR, the State reported that it did not verify the correction of the one finding of noncompliance that the State made in FFY 2009 based on 2008 – 2009 data. Accordingly, OSEP cannot determine whether the State made one or two findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 and how many of those findings were subsequently corrected.</p> <p>Although the State was not required to do so, the State also reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFYs 2009 and 2010 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 2011 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</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.																				
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 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="552 565 1583 1037"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">70.02</td> <td align="center">72.04</td> <td align="center">71.3</td> <td align="center">2.02%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">9.2</td> <td align="center">8.06</td> <td align="center">7.3</td> <td align="center">1.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">3.1</td> <td align="center">2.95</td> <td align="center">3.7</td> <td align="center">0.15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5B.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.02	72.04	71.3	2.02%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.2	8.06	7.3	1.14%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.1	2.95	3.7	0.15%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.02	72.04	71.3	2.02%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.2	8.06	7.3	1.14%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.1	2.95	3.7	0.15%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <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>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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; New]																																		
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 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="548 480 1583 1492"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 480 957 578"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 480 1163 578"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 480 1373 578"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 480 1583 578"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 578 957 716"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 578 1163 716">83.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 578 1373 716">81.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 578 1583 716">83.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 716 957 883"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 716 1163 883">75.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 716 1373 883">80.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 716 1583 883">76.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 883 957 987"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 883 1163 987">79.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 883 1373 987">79.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 883 1583 987">80.3</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 987 957 1084"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 987 1163 1084"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 987 1373 1084"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 987 1583 1084"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1084 957 1222"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1084 1163 1222">84.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1084 1373 1222">73.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1084 1583 1222">84.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1222 957 1390"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1222 1163 1390">73.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1222 1373 1390">64.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1222 1583 1390">74.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1390 957 1492"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1390 1163 1492">84.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1390 1373 1492">69.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1390 1583 1492">84.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	83.1	81.9	83.6	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	75.7	80.6	76.2	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.8	79.3	80.3	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.3	73.5	84.8	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	73.5	64.0	74.0	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	84.2	69.4	84.7	<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 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	83.1	81.9	83.6																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	75.7	80.6	76.2																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.8	79.3	80.3																															
<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.3	73.5	84.8																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	73.5	64.0	74.0																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	84.2	69.4	84.7																															

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>	
<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 FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 49.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 51.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 51%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 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 2011 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 identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that six AUs were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no AUs 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." The State uses two methods and an AU may have a significant discrepancy if it meets the definition in either method one or method two.</p> <p>The State reported that all AUs met the State-established minimum "n" size of 30 students in a race/ethnicity category for method one and a minimum "n" size of 30 students for method two.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 5.17%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 1.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 14 AUs were identified with disproportionate representation of</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2010 data</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that three AUs were 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.” The State uses two methods and an AU may have a significant discrepancy if it meets the definition in either method one or method two.</p> <p>The State reported that all AUs met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category -- if the “n” size is fewer than 30 students within a specific disability and race category (for example 30 Asian students in the autism category), a comparison is not required for that disability category.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP is concerned about the State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining finding identified in FFY 2008. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State’s explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the one district identified in FFY 2008 with noncompliance that was not corrected and the districts identified in FFY 2010 with disproportionate representation of</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>racial and ethnic 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. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State explained that it verified correction of the noncompliance, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, prior to issuing findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>In addition, although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2010, the State explained that it verified correction of the noncompliance, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, prior to issuing findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 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 FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data was corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 83.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2010 data the State reported for this indicator.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>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>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in the FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>										
<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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 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 1417 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher</td> <td align="center">31.1</td> <td align="center">40</td> <td align="center">31.5</td> <td align="center">8.90%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher	31.1	40	31.5	8.90%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Enrolled in higher	31.1	40	31.5	8.90%								

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>school;                      B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.                      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>	education					
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	56.2	64	58	7.80%		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	60.2	67	63	6.80%		
<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>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 44 of 47 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that two findings were subsequently corrected by January 8, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that two of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were subsequently corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical</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 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>remaining two findings identified in FFY 2008. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4B, 10 and 13 in the FFY 2011, 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 means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 reported, as of January 31, 2012, that four of five resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 70.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 63.6%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 55%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.62%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it 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). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011</p>

**Colorado Part B FFY 2010 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>
		APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.