

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 58.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 46.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 54%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 32.64%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 44.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 40%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 23%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 23.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 25%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100% for reading and math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.4% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 99.5% for reading and math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 56.9% for reading and 51.7% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of for 57.3% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 52.3% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 57.5% for reading and 52% math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its baseline data for FFY 2004, improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 1.8%. These data represent progress from the State's revised FFY 2005 data of 3.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 5%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 for: (1) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2004 and 2005 APRs; and (2) any LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State did not submit the required information. This represents noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>The State reported that it expected to complete the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards for the four</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>LEAs identified in FFY 2004 and the 2 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 by July 1, 2008, and for the 1 LEA identified in FFY 2006 by April 1, 2008.</p> <p>Although the State had not conducted the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State identified one finding of noncompliance through other mechanisms for an LEA identified in FFY 2005 with significant discrepancies. That noncompliance was corrected by December 2007.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>In addition, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), for the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data. For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 data whose policies and procedures were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and that were also identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; if so,</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; and whether practices in these areas continue to comply with applicable requirements.																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 951 1419 1333"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">70.5%</td> <td align="center">59.7%</td> <td align="center">70.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">8.5%</td> <td align="center">11.2%</td> <td align="center">7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">3.7%</td> <td align="center">4.8%</td> <td align="center">4.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	70.5%	59.7%	70.5%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8.5%	11.2%	7.7%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	70.5%	59.7%	70.5%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8.5%	11.2%	7.7%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.7%	4.8%	4.1%															

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																									
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 651 1415 1336"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 651 1060 824">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 651 1180 824">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 651 1299 824">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 651 1415 824">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 824 1060 894">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 824 1180 894">20%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 824 1299 894">20%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 824 1415 894">21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 894 1060 1029">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 894 1180 1029">5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 894 1299 1029">6%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 894 1415 1029">5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1029 1060 1131">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1029 1180 1131">4%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1029 1299 1131">6%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1029 1415 1131">4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1131 1060 1234">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1131 1180 1234">13%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1131 1299 1234">12%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1131 1415 1234">11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1234 1060 1336">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1234 1180 1336">58%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1234 1299 1336">56%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1234 1415 1336">59%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	20%	20%	21%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5%	6%	5%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	4%	6%	4%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	13%	12%	11%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	58%	56%	59%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR; (2) information supporting its determination that the pilot districts are representative of the population of children served within the State if the State continues to pilot its data collection and reporting; and (3) clarification of its definition of "comparable to same-aged peers."</p> <p>The State reported the required information.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	20%	20%	21%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5%	6%	5%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	4%	6%	4%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	13%	12%	11%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	58%	56%	59%																							

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 41.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 40.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 45%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) separate targets, if the State is going to use a separate survey that is responsive to Indicator 8 for parents of preschool children; and (2) baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for preschool children if not using the same survey. The State reported that it is using the same instrument to survey parents of all children with disabilities.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2006 and FFY 2005. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) a description of, and report on, its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006; (2) baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.); (3) data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007; (4) data and information that demonstrate that any districts identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311; and (5) clarification regarding the State’s definition for “significant disproportionality” and what steps the State takes if it determines that significant disproportionality is occurring.</p> <p>In response to the above, the State did not provide the required information for items 1–4. The State reported that it revised its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, but has not completed the determination of whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification for LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported that this review would be completed by June 30, 2008. With respect to item 5, the State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data, and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that any LEAs identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services 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.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2006 or for FFY 2005. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) a description of and report on, its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006; (2) baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.); (3) data in its FFY 2006 APR on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007; (4) data and information that demonstrate that any districts identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311; and (5) clarification regarding the State’s definition for “significant disproportionality” and what steps the State takes if it determines that significant disproportionality is occurring.</p> <p>In response to the above, the State did not</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>provide the required information for 1– 4. The State reported that it revised its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but has not completed the determination of whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification for LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, and would complete the required review by June 30, 2008. With respect to item 5, the State provided the required information regarding significant disproportionality in its response to Indicator 9.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data, and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 as having significant disproportionality 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.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures and practices since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 84.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that one out of six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by January 24, 2007.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 the baseline and revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.1%, which is the State's baseline. OSEP could not determine progress or slippage because the State does not have FFY 2004 or FFY 2005 data available for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner and that the two remaining findings were corrected by January 24, 2007.</p>	<p>the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) baseline data for FFY 2004; (2) progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006; and (3) an explanation if unable to provide data. The State did not report data for FFY 2004 or FFY 2005. However, the State provided an explanation as to why it is unable to collect this data. The State provided data for FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 2.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that one of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by January 8, 2007.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 44.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 19.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 25%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 of 56 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by the time of the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) recalculated data for FFY 2005 using the proper measurement (individual and systemic violations), and the proper standard of correction; and (2) a report on the status of the two AUs that remain out of compliance on the requirements of 34 CFR §300.160 regarding districtwide assessments. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>With respect to the AUs that had been out of compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.160 regarding districtwide assessments, the State reported that one AU corrected the noncompliance and that the other AU remains out of compliance. For the latter, the State reported that it issued a letter of concern and is in the process of ensuring correction. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must provide updated data and information on</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the status of correction for this AU.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>Other issues relating to the State’s general supervision, including requests for additional data and information to be reported in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, are addressed in OSEP’s May 9, 2008 verification letter.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.86%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: clarification on whether a complaint was properly extended pursuant to 34 CFR §300.152(b)(1). The State provided the required information and indicated that its FFY 2005 data for this indicator was correct.</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution</p>

Colorado Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully 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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 50%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process resolution 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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 42.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 88%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 66%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 did not provide the FFY 2006 actual target data percentage for this indicator. The State reported actual target data for FFY 2005 for 50% in timeliness and 90% in accuracy. OSEP cannot determine if the State meant to report this as FFY 2006 data. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 79.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide actual target data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>OSEP addressed additional issues involving the State's data system in its May 9, 2008 verification letter.</p>