

Table A - Colorado Part B
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p><u>Other:</u> An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology, with its FFY 2005 APR, that describes how data were collected. In the FFY 2005 APR, you must explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Other:</u> The State did not provide the baseline data required under Indicator 12. For Indicator 12a., the State provided the number of children "referred to Part B for eligibility determination." However, on page 47 of the SPP, the State reported that it is unable to determine how many children who have IEPs by their 3rd birthdays were previously served by Part C. For indicator 12b, the State provided data on the number of children referred who were determined to be not eligible for Part B, but provided no data on the number of these children whose eligibility was determined prior to their 3rd birthdays. Finally, for Indicator 12c on page 48 of the SPP, the State reported that</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, baseline data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include data will affect OSEP's determination in 2007 of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
	<p>“no data is available detailing the # of Part B eligible children who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.”</p>	
<p>Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Other:</u> OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new indicator 13 will result in the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><u>Other:</u> On page 55 of the SPP, CDE stated that “...our collection of dropout rates are hampered by the lack of information on students who ‘transfer, not known to be continuing’ due to the lack of a statewide student identification and data collection system.”</p> <p>See also the discussion of indicator 12 in Table A and indicator 4A in Table B.</p> <p>While the State provided some information that allows OSEP to make inferences regarding the State’s intended targets for indicator 20, the State did not explicitly indicate that its targets are 100% for both timely data and accurate data reports.</p>	<p>The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include the required data in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to report data at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>The State should reconsider the baseline data provided for indicator 4A of the SPP and provide accurate information, including improvement activities, in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information in this indicator may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>The State must revise the targets in the APR, due February 1, 2007, to clarify that it is the State’s intent to reach 100% accuracy and 100% timeliness regarding data reported, whether to OSEP or to the public, under section 618 of the IDEA, in the SPP and in the APRs.</p>