

CO Part B

FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Annual Performance Report Updates:

Introduction page:

Colorado has a total of 66 Administrative Units (AUs) or LEAs responsible for the provision of special education to students with disabilities. During FFY 2017 the Colorado Department of Education approved the application and start-up of two new Administrative Units (AUs). A table has been included to give an overview of all the indicators' status and to note if the targets were met and/or there was slippage. In addition, we have provided a brief update of changes made to the report by indicators, please see below.

Summary of Indicator Targets and Slippage

Indicator	Was Target Met?	Was there Slippage?
1	Yes	No
2	Yes	No
3b	No	No
3c	No	No
4a	Yes	No
4b	Yes	No
5a	Yes	No
5b	Yes	No
5c	Yes	No
6a	Yes	No
6b	Yes	No
7a1	No	Yes
7a2	No	Yes
7b1	No	Yes
7b2	No	No
7c1	No	Yes
7c2	No	Yes
8	Yes	No

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

9	Yes	No
10	Yes	No
11	No	No
12	No	No
13	No	Yes
14a	No	No
14b	Yes	No
14c	Yes	No

Indicator 1:

Updated the baseline and targets and methodology per the States' ESSA Plan.

Indicator 3B

Pre-populated data in Grads 360 is incorrect. Therefore, a chart with the correct data was included as an attachment in the Indicator 3B section.

Indicator 7:

Contributing factors may be due to changes made by the vendor to the measurement tool and improvement in the identification process in Part C resulting in identification of more children needing services.

Indicator 8:

An analyses of the demographics of survey response rate was conducted. The state updated strategies to be use in ensuring future response data are representative of those demographics.

Indicator 11:

Provided explanation of the technical assistance provided through the differentiated monitoring and supports as part of Colorado's Continuous Improvement Process (CCIP) in accordance with OSEP memo 09-02.

Indicator 12:

Provided explanation for of the technical assistance provided through the differentiated monitoring and supports as part of Colorado's Continuous Improvement Process (CCIP) in accordance with OSEP memo 09-02.

Indicator 13:

Provided explanation for slippage and gave examples of the technical assistance provided through the differentiated monitoring and supports as part of Colorado's Continuous Improvement Process (CCIP) in accordance with OSEP memo 09-02.

Indicator 16:

Provided explanation for slippage and gave examples of the technical assistance provided through the differentiated monitoring and supports as part of Colorado's Continuous Improvement Process (CCIP).

Technical Assistance Accessed by the State in 2017-2018

In response to the States' Determination of Needs Assistance, we have accessed the following technical assistance noted below towards improving the SEA's personnel capacity.

Results Driven Accountability

1. Name of Technical Assistance Providers / Description

1. National Center for Systemic Improvement: Results Based Accountability Learning Collaborative provided targeted technical assistance (virtual & in-person)
2. IDEA Data Center provided targeted technical assistance (virtual & in-person)
3. Office of Special Education Programs (virtual & in-person)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
SEA Implementation / Change of Practice as result of TA

1. Refined results determination matrix for districts and provided universal and targeted technical assistance to districts including general supervision virtual audits
2. Refined new results driven general supervision process and risk assessment to inform designation for intensive TA
3. Updated Significant Disproportionality targets and provided universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance for districts
4. Specific learning from IEP High Expectations Virtual Symposium

Indicators 1, 13, 14 (Graduation, Transition and Post School Outcomes)

Name of Technical Assistance Providers / Description

1. National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI virtual and in person): Graduation and Post School Outcomes Cross-State Learning Collaborative provided Targeted Technical Assistance
2. National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT virtual and in person)

SEA Implementation / Change of Practice as result of TA

1. Working towards evidence-based practices (e.g., Check and Connect) in Low Performing Systems as identified through ESSA.
2. AU Transition Action Plans (TAPs)-ensured the soundness of the AUs Transition Action Plans
3. Provided facilitator training and follow-up on the State Toolkit for Examining Post School Success for transition senior consultants.
4. Provided support AUs who participated in the Transition Coalition Self-Study: Building a Transition Assessment Toolkit

Indicator 3: (Achievement)

Name of Technical Assistance Providers / Description

1. Name of Technical Assistance Providers / Description
2. National Center for Systemic Improvement Literacy Learning Collaborative: Targeted Technical Assistance (virtual & in-person)
3. Collaboration for Educator Effectiveness, Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR): Intensive Technical Assistance (virtual & in-person)
4. WestEd: Targeted technical assistance both (virtual and in person)
5. Chief Council of State School Officers (virtual and in person)

SEA Implementation / Change of Practice as result of TA

1. Updated Phase III, year Three of the SSIP
2. Continued syllabi review using the Innovation Configuration for K-5 Reading Instruction with an Institute of Higher Education to align programming to streamline professional learning between pre-service learning, new teacher learning, and professional licensure
3. Tweaked embedded coaching model according to lessons learned
4. Standards and Instruction Cross Department Collaboration and Revised Standards roll out plan
5. Development of guidelines for serving dually identified students (SPED/EL) and the development of a Special Education and English Language Learners Symposium

Indicator 6 & 7: (Preschool Settings and Skills)

Name of Technical Assistance Providers / Description

1. The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
2. 619 Consortium
3. DaSy Powerful 619 Data Cohort and Conference
4. Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID)-Intensive Technical Assistance Agreement-ongoing calls and Tmeetings

SEA Implementation/Change of Practice as a result of TA

1. Helped provide context to Colorado stakeholders regarding what is happening across the country which is assisting in the target setting discussions
2. Updated data governance from the ECTA Framework
3. Implementing plan for enhancing data quality that included use case scenarios and technological assistance for data integration.
4. Continued work on data governance guidelines with the Department of Human Services for Part C

Indicator 8: (Parent Engagement)

Name of Technical Assistance Providers/Description

1. PEAK Parent Training Center "Serving on Groups"

SEA Implementation/Change of Practice as a result of TA

1. This training was incorporated into the State's work with the State mandated Colorado Special Education Advisory Council

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

66

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU) provides leadership, resources, support, and accountability for 66 Administrative Units (AU), to help them build capacity to meet the needs of the students who are receiving special education services in Colorado. Data is gathered from individual districts comprising both single and multiple member Administrative Units (AU). The Board Of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) districts' data is rolled up into regional, multiple member AUs.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

While the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) continues to monitor compliance to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Colorado's Exceptional Children's Education Act (ECEA), our focus is partnering with Administrative Units (AUs) to improve results for students with disabilities. The Colorado Continuous Improvement Process is focused on successful outcomes for students with disabilities through an AU tiered determination system that guides the provision of a layered continuum of support as described below.

The CDE is committed to working collaboratively with AUs to develop and strengthen their capacity to implement, scale-up, and sustain system change at the AU level. This will facilitate increased student achievement performance and positive outcomes for students with disabilities through the provision of a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Colorado Continuous Improvement Process Objectives:

1. Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic performance and outcomes for students with disabilities by linking AU data, including indicator data, to improvement activities.
2. Partner with AUs to ensure compliance with IDEA and ECEA regulations.
3. Connect AU-level and school-level improvement activities with IDEA and ECEA regulations.
4. Support each AU in the process of self-audit, evaluation, and improvement of instructional effectiveness and compliance to ensure growth in student academic performance and outcomes.
5. Link improvement activities with long term, multi-year professional development to support capacity building and sustainability of compliance and instructional effectiveness.

We gather continuous improvement data that includes the AU's self-report and summary of analyses of student performance data as well as self-audits of student records for compliance. Additional AU data and policies, procedures, and processes to be reviewed include family-school partnering and involvement, staff qualifications, fiscal reporting, discipline, use of data for instructional planning, secondary transition and post-school outcomes, disproportionate representation, IEP components corresponding to student achievement, and professional development.

Student Data Includes:

- Prevalence rate by disability, race, and ethnic categories
- Percentage of time with students without disabilities
- Educational placement of students with disabilities
- Evaluation time lines
- IEP implementation time lines
- Performance on state assessments
- Preschool outcomes
- Graduation and dropout rates
- Extra-curricular opportunities and integration with peers without disabilities and educational settings for preschool students with disabilities
- Students exiting special education
- Data regarding disciplinary exclusions, including desegregation by disability, race, and ethnic categories
- Transition IEP data
- Post School Outcome data

The CDE in partnership with AUs uses data and information from available sources to verify and augment information described above. Data obtained are used to evaluate the performance of AUs on the State Performance Plan indicators and their related requirements. These data are examined and triangulated to determine:

- Related themes or relationships of performance on indicators. (e.g., Part B graduation rates with test performance and transition planning)
- Existence of patterns or trends over time (i.e., is the AU's performance improving or slipping)
- Consistency with other known factors
- Areas of non-compliance
- Potential areas of non-compliance
- Poor student performance
- Need for additional support in building capacity and sustainability of compliance and instructional effectiveness

Staff data are those related to:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Licensure
- Credentials (e.g., Braille competency)
- Highly qualified status of special education staff
- Staff caseload information, including staff to student ratios
- The Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU) staff works closely with other units within the CDE to monitor and track licenses and highly qualified status of special education providers; Feedback is provided to AUs on the status of their staff

Fiscal data are those collected from:

The ESSU staff works closely with other units within the CDE to ensure that each AU meets requirements specific to excess cost calculation, maintenance of effort, and allowable use of funds. In addition we also consider the following:

- IDEA Part B and Preschool Narratives and Budgets
- Fiscal End of Year reporting

Data from dispute resolution include:

- Dispute resolution findings, including complaints and due process
- Areas of concern identified outside the scope of dispute resolution findings

Data are analyzed to ensure completion of procedures in a timely manner, effectiveness or success of the procedures in resolving disputes, trends in issues identified through the processes, and trends for specific AUs that may imply non-compliance with state and federal regulations. This information is reviewed as part of general supervision activities. Analyses of the nature of concerns expressed, findings, and timeliness of correction is conducted.

Selection of AUs:

Every AU will annually conduct self-audits via the ESSU State wide Data Management System to analyze trends in the following areas:

- Performance data at the state and local level
- Student record reviews and other data collection to ensure compliance of the SPP Indicators
- Family School engagement data gathered through the state's parent survey
- Fiscal policies and procedures

Verification of Correction and Enforcement Activities:

The CDE AU Partners work collaboratively with the AU Directors of Special Education programs to identify root causes of trends that may result in non-compliance and/or to provide technical assistance to support AUs in correcting non-compliance and building capacity in the sustainability of compliance. In all instances of child-specific non-compliance resulting in the denial of FAPE, immediate correction is required.

The Colorado Continuous Improvement Process focuses on successful results and compliance of the SPP Indicators for students with disabilities through a tiered system with a layered continuum of support.

Tier 1 - Universal Support

- Utilization of annual self-monitoring process
- Compliant with ECEA Rules and IDEA Regulations

Tier 2 - Targeted Support

- Compliance concerns identified in data-base monitoring and annual self-monitoring process
- Result indicators not meeting targets
- The AU requests support with self-monitoring and compliance procedures
- The AU requests support for strategies to meet SPP targets

Tier 3 - Intensive Support

- AU has not corrected self-audit / data-base monitoring concerns
- Result indicators not meeting targets
- A Corrective Action Plan will be developed and monitored by ESSU

Measurement for Determinations (FFY 2017):

- Two points, if the AU's data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance
- One point, if the AU's FFY 2017 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance
- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
 - The AU's data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance; or
 - The AU's data for the indicator were not valid and reliable; or
 - The AU did not report data for the indicator.

A description of the CDE's dispute resolution process follows:

Mediation:

Mediation is made available at no cost to parties who have disputes involving any matter under Part B. Mediation is voluntary and may not be used to deny or delay a parent's right to initiate IDEA's other dispute resolution options. If a mediation agreement is reached, it is reduced to a written settlement agreement enforceable in any court of competent jurisdiction.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

When CDE receives a request for mediation, dispute resolution staff confirm that both parties are voluntarily agreeing to mediation. Once both parties have agreed to mediation, a mediator is assigned based on a random or rotational basis. Mediators typically conduct mediations within 30 days, provide CDE with an outcome report for data purposes, and supply the parties with mediation evaluation forms.

CDE actively encourages parties to consider resolving their disputes through mediation, typically under the following circumstances: (1) when a parent contacts CDE to find out what his/her dispute resolution rights are; (2) when a state complaint is filed; or (3) when a due process complaint is filed. If the parties resolve their disputes through a written and binding mediation agreement, the parties notify the State Complaint Officer (SCO) (in the case of a state complaint) or the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) (in the case of a due process complaint) that the agreement has been reached and that the complaint is being withdrawn or should be dismissed. If the parties reach impasse or partial agreement, the state complaint investigation or due process proceeding resumes as to all remaining issues.

From July of 2010 to December of 2017, the CDE utilized Administrative Law Judges, through an Interagency Agreement with the State Department of Personnel and Administration, Office of Administrative Courts (OAC) to provide IDEA mediation services. In the fall of 2017, the OAC notified CDE that they would no longer be able to continue providing mediation services. Consequently, the CDE transitioned to independent contract mediators to provide IDEA mediation services, beginning December 1, 2017.

State Complaints Process:

The state complaints process is available to any party. When a state complaint is filed, the SCO has up to ten (10) calendar days to notify the complainants whether the complaint is being accepted for investigation. CDE accepts the complaint for investigation if: (1) CDE has jurisdiction to investigate the complaint (i.e., the complaint alleges a violation of the IDEA), (2) the complaint meets the required content requirements, and (3) the complaint was filed within the applicable statute of limitations. CDE notifies the complainants that the complaint is being rejected if it does not meet these requirements.

When a complaint is accepted for investigation, the consultant from the General Supervision team assigned to dispute resolution is notified of the complaint.

The AU is given the opportunity to provide a written response and proposed resolution to the complaint, and the parent is given the opportunity to reply to the AU's written response or otherwise provided with an opportunity to provide additional information. Following the exchange of written information, the SCO may further investigate, as necessary, using a variety of investigative techniques including telephone interviews, review of records, and on-site investigations. Upon completion of the investigation, the SCO issues a decision that includes findings of fact and conclusions of law. The complaint must be resolved within sixty (60) calendar days from the date it was filed, unless the SCO extends the decision due date for exceptional circumstances unique to that complaint or the parties both agree to extend the decision date to engage in mediation.

If the SCO finds the AU to be in violation of the IDEA, the SCO orders a remedy, which may include corrective action, compensatory services, the revision of policies and procedures, staff training, etc. The decision establishes dates for when the remedy must be completed and identifies the documentation that must be submitted to demonstrate that corrective action has been taken. A copy of the decision is made available to the ESSU General Supervision Team. The decision is also placed in the AU's monitoring file to serve as a data source for monitoring. Follow-up for corrective action is currently the responsibility of the ESSU General Supervision consultant responsible for dispute resolution.

CDE's SCOs are attorneys and members of the ESSU's dispute resolution team. The SCOs attend special education legal conferences such as LRP's National Institute on Legal Issues of Education Individuals with Disabilities.

Due Process Hearings:

CDE utilizes Administrative Law Judges, through an Interagency Agreement with the State Department of Personnel and Administration, Office of Administrative Courts (OAC), to provide IDEA due process hearings. In coordination with OAC, the ESSU's dispute resolution team tracks applicable timelines to ensure compliance with IDEA, and provides a copy of the ALJ's decision for publication and dissemination to the state special education advisory committee. The ESSU provides ALJ training through the CDE or by qualified trainers/presenters in the area of special education law, including the CDE's special education legal conference.

Per state rules, the special education director for the AU is required to notify CDE immediately upon receipt of a due process hearing request and to fax or mail a copy of the due process complaint to CDE.

If the ALJ orders remedies against the AU, the General Supervision Team is notified, and the decision is placed in the AU's monitoring file to serve as a data source for monitoring. The ESSU General Supervision team monitors compliance with the ALJ's decision, unless that decision is appealed to state or federal court.

Facilitated IEP Process:

The CDE supports IEP facilitation to resolve issues within the IEP development for the prevention of legal disputes that may lead to mediation, state complaints or due process. The Alternative Dispute Resolution Project through CDE supports impartial IEP facilitation, which is a preventative approach that provides support for: resolving conflict, bringing the team to consensus on issues, and completing an IEP focused on meeting student needs. IEP facilitation is for any issues that prevent the IEP team from working together to create a successful IEP.

CDE currently offers state wide facilitators to support districts and parents in the IEP process. CDE is also building up a reciprocal approach to IEP facilitation where districts share those certified in IEP facilitation with each other. IEP facilitator certification training is provided through CDE, as well as a training for trainer-of-trainers, in order to build sustainability throughout the state.

IEP facilitation provided by CDE is free of charge, and a request can be made by a parent or a district, however, both parties must be in agreement to use facilitation services. If there are continued issues after using IEP facilitation, the other dispute resolution options are available.

In order to obtain a state wide IEP facilitator, a parent or a district submits a request to CDE at this link <http://www.cde.state.co.us/spedlaw/edr>. An agreement by both parties is then secured, and a facilitator is assigned. The facilitator will then contact both parties to set the meeting data and time (if not already scheduled) and to create an agenda. The agenda is then agreed upon by all at the IEP meeting or adjusted prior to the start of the meeting. An Agreement to Participate in IEP Facilitation form is signed to ensure that all understand the role of the facilitator, and an evaluation of the process is provided at the end of the meeting to identify success and areas in the process that need improvement.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

In addition to CDE Exceptional Students Services Consultants being available via email, telephone, and in person to address AU specific requests for technical assistance (TA), as a part of the General Supervision System the Colorado Continuous Improvement Process focuses on providing TA, through a layered continuum of support. The layered continuum of support is the mechanism in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based support to the Administrative Units (AU). The tiered rating received by the AU determines the intensity, duration, and frequency of the technical assistance provided.

Tier 1 - Universal Support for those who Meet Requirements

An AU has demonstrated successful self-monitoring, improved outcomes in student achievement, compliance with IDEA/ECEA regulations based on policies, procedures, and self-audits of student records, and effective use of professional resources. Student achievement will be measured against individualized performance targets set by CDE per district and per AU. Each AU will report to the CDE on an annual basis. All reports will be reviewed by the CDE. A random sample of AUs will be selected for a reliability review on specific SPP indicators by the CDE. Examples of Universal Supports include, but are not limited to tools and resources on the website, conferences, and webinars.

Tier 2 - Targeted Support for those who Need Improvement

An AU has multiple areas of moderate need demonstrated over 12-18 months that are reflected in student achievement data and the AU may also have issues of non-compliance based on its self-audits of IEP-related documentation. The AU's specific area(s) of need are targeted through TA activities and interventions outlined in an improvement plan developed by the AU with support and follow up from the CDE. Additional data on AU identified area(s) of need will be collected, either through an on-site or desk audit of the AU data submission. A progress report based on the improvement plan is to be submitted by the AU on a quarterly basis for a maximum of 4 quarters. Examples of Targeted Supports include, but are not limited to side-by-side assistance, in-person professional learning, tools and resources for specific drill down into areas of concern.

Tier 3 - Intensive Support for those who Need Intervention

An AU continues to have either one area of intense need or multiple areas of moderate need that are not improved or corrected within 12-18 months, in spite of improvement activities and CDE support. An AU may be issued findings of insufficient growth and non-compliance at this tier. Evidence includes student achievement data and/or results of self-audits regarding compliance and implementation of IDEA and ECEA regulations, verified by CDE record review. A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) will be developed jointly by the AU and the CDE. The AU will receive intensive support from the CDE (e.g., multiple site visits, professional development, increased data reporting to the CDE in targeted area(s)). The CDE will follow-up with AUs regarding their CAP on a monthly basis. A written progress report based on the CAP is to be submitted by the AU on a monthly basis, with specific data provided as evidence of growth. If timely correction of findings does not occur within one year of the date of issue, sanctions may be imposed. Examples of Targeted Supports include, but are not limited to required side-by-side assistance, required in-person professional learning, tools and resources for specific drill down into areas of concern, priority registration for conferences, and TA customized per the specific needs of the Administrative Unit.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Colorado has a number of systems in place to ensure that providers have the skills to work effectively with students with disabilities. Institutions of higher education in the state work closely with the CDE and the Department of Higher Education to ensure programs that cover the range of skills and knowledge required of teachers of students with disabilities. Of the eleven public, four-year colleges/universities in Colorado, nine of them offer undergraduate and/or graduate degrees and licensure programs in special education. In addition, there are two private schools and one for-profit school that offer special education degrees.

The Colorado Department of Education is responsible for the content review of all teacher preparation programs, both traditional and alternate, to ensure that any program seeking authorization or reauthorization meets the state standards defined in statute, State Board of Education rules and CDE policy and guidance. Initial approval and reauthorization are required for any institution offering educator preparation programs leading to endorsement in Colorado, including public, private and out-of-state institutions. The ESSU works with the CDE Office of Professional Services and Licensing to review the content of any program that seeks to prepare teachers in special education and related fields. The well-defined process ensures that programs offered throughout the state meet the Performance Based Standards for Colorado Teachers and the endorsement related standards delineated in the Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991.

Additionally, the CDE is actively engaged in the enhancement of skills and knowledge required of licensed educators currently working in the field. The CDE ESSU provides professional development in areas identified by teachers, related service providers, local Directors of Special Education, and ESSU consultants. Informal surveys are conducted at least annually with Directors of Special Education who are asked to note topics for professional development required by their staff(s) which then are prioritized and offered to the field. Certain Professional Learning opportunities are required for individuals from Administrative Units that are identified for Intensive Intervention. Additionally, content specialists in the Unit provide ongoing professional development for educators and specialized service personnel in their respective disciplines (e.g., teachers of the visually impaired, teachers of students with autism, speech-

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
(language pathologists, school psychologists, etc.)

The ESSU, in collaboration with other offices across the CDE, also engage in Professional Learning for field personnel that have been identified through State or Federal Accountability. These low performing systems have the opportunity to access State and Federal school improvement funds to specifically address issues of identification. The department has developed a single entry point for all districts to apply for a myriad of services through what is known as a Menu of Supports. (see attached) This Menu of Supports has updates annually and needs are identified. The ESSU also partners with other Units in the Department to host an annual Equity and Excellence Conference, a READ Conference, and These two conferences reach 1,000+ educators annually.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The 2013 -2018 Colorado State Performance Plan was drafted internally by team members from the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU). Throughout the process input was gathered from numerous internal Colorado Department of Education stakeholder groups which included: the Office of Learning Supports, the Office of Literacy, the Office of Early Learning & School Readiness, the Office of Student Assessments, the Federal Programs Unit, the Office of Accountability, the Office of District & School Performance Unit, and the Improvement Planning Unit. The ESSU gathered input from these internal stakeholder groups to assist in developing SPP targets.

Additionally, representatives from the following groups participated in various stages throughout the process: the Directors of Special Education from across the State, the Colorado Special Education Advisory Council (CSEAC), the Family, School & Community Partnering Community of Practice, Colorado's Parents Training and Information (PTI) Center, Parents/families of students with disabilities, the Preschool Advisory Committee, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center, representatives from the Higher Education Council in Colorado, Transition Coordinators, the Colorado Department of Human Services - Early Intervention Office, DaSy, and Indicator Teams.

Input was provided by these multiple stakeholder groups in a variety of methods, most commonly in the form of face-to-face discussions, planned meetings, and regularly scheduled meetings. Technology was also utilized to communicate via telephone, the CDE website, and email. The tasks requested of these groups were related to the development of a new State Performance Plan, such as reviewing and establishing baselines and targets, assisting in determining an appropriate State-identified Measurable Result for the State Systemic Improvement Plan, provide input regarding a coherent set of improvement activities, and input into the likely efficacy of the strategies proposed that will assist local Administrative Units and the ESSU in improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

A stakeholder group (consisting of AU Directors of Special Education, CDE Accountability Office, Federal Programs, and the ESSU) met during the 2014-2017 school years and analyzed the process related to AU determinations. This group of Stakeholders made recommendations and developed changes to the AU determination process based upon the Colorado Growth Model and other contributing factors. Extensive input was sought from a wide representation of stakeholders with ongoing meetings throughout the entire decision making process. Finalization and approval of the AU Determination Matrices occurred in spring of 2017.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

Following the submission of the State Performance Plan to the U.S. Department of Education, the ESSU posts the final version on the CDE website and alerts constituency groups of its availability via existing list-serves. It is available at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/spp-apr>

Hard copies are provided to any individual making a request for one.

Administrative Unit (AU) State Performance Plan Indicator Profiles are reports to the public required by IDEA 2004. These publicly posted reports are regarding each AU's performance compared to State targets and State performance for 14 indicators from the State Performance Plan (SPP). The Administrative Unit (AU) State Performance Plan Indicator Profiles are posted on the Colorado Department of Education at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/AUperformanceprofiles.asp> no later than 120 days following the submission of the SPP/APR.

Additional Special Education Data Reports can be found at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/resultsmatter/account>

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped_data

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			54.00%	72.00%	57.40%	59.50%	63.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data		46.80%	58.10%	62.93%	64.30%	64.30%	52.00%	53.46%	53.66%	53.80%	54.63%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	80.00%	73.40%
Data	53.78%	57.24%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	75.00%	76.60%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Using the methodology fully described in the ESSA Plan, Colorado examined annual increases in the percentages of its students graduating, using the 7-year cohort graduation rate. On average Colorado has shown a gain of 1.6% per year on the extended 7-year graduation rate. Utilizing the same five-year timeframe and gap closure methodology as described in the ESSA Plan, student groups will be expected to close the gap to a 100% best of graduation rate by 25% within 5 years. This approach ensures that disaggregated groups with lower starting graduation rates will be expected to make faster progress, while simultaneously ensuring all student groups are held to rigorous expectations, by requiring all disaggregated groups to continue making progress. The targets are rigorous for all students.

Additional information may be found at:

www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/co-consolidatedstateplan-final-websitepdf

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Colorado's Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement in State Plan Development:

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) recognizes that ongoing and meaningful stakeholder engagement is essential to the effective development and successful implementation of Colorado's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) state plan on behalf of Colorado students. CDE committed to providing multiple avenues and opportunities for interested individuals and organizations to review the decision points, options, recommendations, and drafts and provide feedback throughout the design and development of Colorado's ESSA plan. In addition, CDE committed to making the stakeholder consultation and plan development process as meaningful and transparent as possible. These efforts included frequent and widely disseminated updates on the process, timelines, and opportunities to engage at different stages and levels of plan development.

Colorado's roadmap in support of effective stakeholder consultation included the following overarching strategies to promote engagement and participation opportunities: Building awareness and establishing a variety of communication channels with schools, districts, and the public through online and virtual engagement; Meeting with stakeholder groups throughout the plan development process, including, but not limited to: a statewide Listening Tour, participation opportunities in ESSA Committees, and multiple recurring meetings with critical education partners; Posting plan drafts and decision points for public input and comment prior to submission to USDE; Developing a formalized internal process to incorporate and address stakeholder feedback as appropriate; and Creating a system of continuous feedback to remove any barriers that could prevent broad, meaningful, and authentic engagement.

Stakeholder Meetings and Engagement with Critical Partners through Plan Development:

Concurrent with the development of an open and transparent online presence, the Department began planning for a multi-stage public input and stakeholder consultation effort to collect input and feedback on the components of the state plan at several stages and in various platforms throughout plan development. A statewide ESSA Listening Tour was a first step towards gathering broad and geographically diverse input and feedback from across the state on how Colorado should implement vital components of ESSA. Following the ESSA Listening Tour, the Department convened a Hub Committee and multiple spoke committees to begin reviewing and making recommendations on options to address ESSA state plan requirements. The committees used the Listening Tour feedback as a starting point for discussion and decision making. After recommendations and decisions were incorporated into state plan drafts, CDE circled back to the public by posting a draft plan for public review and comments. Through all steps, CDE consulted with critical education partners and the State Board of Education.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In total, through formal and informal listening events, CDE engaged in discussion regarding ESSA with more than 1,500 people across Colorado. From these listening events, more than 3,800 comments were gathered. Participants in the Listening Tour sessions represented a wide range of demographics and included stakeholders from the State Board of Education, the Colorado Education Association, Colorado Association of School Boards, Colorado Association of School Executives, school and district administrators (including superintendents and district Board of Education members), school staff (principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, etc.), college and university administrators, parents, and members of the community including those representing nonprofit organizations, advocacy groups, advisory groups, and other interested parties. CDE also engaged with specific constituency groups and liaisons, such as Head Start, McKinney-Vento, Gifted Education State Advisory Committee, Youth Council, Arts360, Adult Education, the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee, IDEA, and Native Americans, for their thoughts, ideas, and feedback. The conversation with our Native American constituents has led to larger conversations and consultation with Colorado tribal groups (See the section on "Native American Tribal Consultation" for more information on this process.).

Additional information can be found at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/co-consolidatedstateplan-final-websitpdf>

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,723	4399
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6,553	5,832
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	56.81%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

Our alternate data is based upon our states' extended 7 year adjusted co-hort rate which aligns to our ESSA plan.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
4,399	5,832	57.24%	75.00%	75.43%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: Extended ACGR

Provide the number of years 7

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Colorado is a locally controlled State. This means that every local district has the authority to adapt the determinations of competencies to accommodate students with exceptionalities (e.G., Students with disabilities). The goal is that all students earning a high school diploma will be prepared for the expectations facing them the day after graduation: proceeding to college-level classes, entering the military, career, training, or earning a salary without need for retraining or remediation. Colorado's Graduation Guidelines were adopted by the State Board of Education in May 2013 in support of this goal which began a the seven-year implementation period and conversation around graduation guidelines as well as next steps in supporting Districts in this work.

During the 2013-14 academic year Districts were encouraged to review the State Board approved graduation guidelines and adopt local graduation requirements that meet or exceed them. Colorado is a local control state and pertinent state law provides that: Each school district board of education shall retain the authority to develop its own unique high school graduation requirements, so long as those local high school graduation requirements meet or exceed any minimum standards or basic core competencies or skills identified in the comprehensive set of guidelines for high school graduation developed by the state board. (Colorado Revised Statute §22-2-106(1)(a.5). Additionally, local districts retain the authority to adapt the determinations of competencies to accommodate students with exceptionalities (e.G., Students with disabilities, students who are gifted and talented). Local district high school graduation policies must allow students multiple, equally rigorous, and valued ways to demonstrate competency of the knowledge and skills necessary for post secondary education and meaningful careers. Additionally, local Districts may permit any students a longer or shorter time to earn their diploma.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			40.00%	39.50%	39.50%	39.00%	2.40%	2.30%	27.20%	26.20%	25.20%
Data		44.40%	33.60%	31.65%	2.80%	2.40%	2.30%	30.02%	28.19%	25.31%	25.43%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	25.20%	25.20%
Data	23.02%	23.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	24.20%	23.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was gathered from a variety of meetings and in multiple contexts across the state. To better focus and coordinate efforts, CDE established and expanded a comprehensive Unit of Dropout Prevention and Student Engagement. This unit is made up of six programs and initiatives including Colorado Graduation Pathways, Expelled and At-Risk Student Services, Foster Care Education, School Counselor Corps, 21st Century Community Learning Center, and McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Youth. Staff members of the Exceptional Student Services Unit have been active participants in the efforts of the Dropout Prevention Unit by the sharing of information, resources, and alignment of the Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP) requirements with current IEP activities and practices, development and dissemination of materials, cross-training, and facilitating involvement of special education providers at the local level. Input has been gathered from the Dropout Prevention Unit regarding dropout rate for students with disabilities and establishing rigorous and attainable targets.

Another Stakeholder group that provided input to the targets was the Secondary Initiatives Collaborative Group which met monthly. This group provided essential feedback regarding dropout prevention for students with disabilities and input regarding appropriate targets for students with disabilities. The group consisted of the following CDE Divisions, Offices, and Units: Dropout Prevention and Engagement, Language Culture & Equity, Standards and Instructional Support, Achievement and Strategy, Accountability and Data Analysis, the Assessment Unit, Improvement Planning, Federal Programs, Learning Supports, Teaching & Learning, Postsecondary Readiness, Innovation & Choice, Online & Blended Learning, and Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU).

State Directors of Special Education also participated in discussions regarding dropout data, as well as a special committee that had met for 4 years, entitled Reinventing Special Education. This group consisted of members from Higher Education, the Parent Training and Information Center (PEAK Parent), Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC), Mountain Plains Resource Center, Directors of Special Education, and the Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU). Additionally, stakeholders from the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee met in November 2014 and reviewed previous dropout data. An explanation of how dropout rates are calculated was provided to stakeholders. Targets were discussed and input was recorded. Stakeholders are encouraged to see dropout rates decreasing after the collaborative work regarding dropout prevention.

The Colorado Department of Education engaged L. Morgan (2014) to conduct a literature review to "provide an update to the dropout prevention best practices from around the country, in order to better address the goals of the Colorado Department of Education as outlined in the January, 2014 strategic plan (CDE, 2014)" (p. 3). Since we strongly believe that students with disabilities are general education students first, the work of the Dropout Prevention and Re-engagement Unit certainly applies to students with disabilities as we continue to break down the silos between general education and special education.

Morgan (2014) states, "The intervention strategies chosen from the field will directly apply to these goals and provide educators, counselors, and administrators with effective ways of providing support for diverse groups of students around the state" (p. 3). The review is attached and available at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cgpbestpracticeguide>

Citation: Morgan, L. (2014). Review of the literature in dropout prevention. Colorado Department of Education, USDE High School Graduation Initiatives Project. Denver, CO: Colorado Department of Education.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
 Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,848	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	68	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	93	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,147	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	28	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,147	5,184	23.62%	24.20%	22.13%

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

By Colorado law, a dropout is a "person who leaves school for any reason, except death, before completion of a high school diploma or its equivalent, and who does not transfer to another public or private school or enroll in an approved home study program." A student is not a dropout if he/she transfers to an educational program recognized by the district, completes a G.E.D. or registers in a program leading to a G.E.D., is committed to an institution that maintains educational programs, or is so ill that he/she is unable to participate in a homebound or special therapy program. Students who reach the age of 21 before receiving a diploma or designation of completion ("age-outs") are also counted as dropouts.

The Colorado dropout rate is an annual rate, reflecting the percentage of all students enrolled in grades 7-12 who leave school during a single school year without subsequently attending another school or educational program. It is calculated by dividing the number of dropouts by a membership base which includes all students who were in membership any time during the year. In accordance with a 1993 legislative mandate, beginning with the 1993-94 school year, the dropout rate calculation excludes expelled students.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? **Yes**

Provide what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs and explain the difference.

In Colorado, students who are considered "exited from special education due to drop out" as reported in the SPP are students who are reported by the districts in one of the following areas: Transfer to a Career or Technical Education Program, Discontinued Schooling/Dropped Out, Expulsion, GED Transfer, Student Received GED from Non-District Program in the Same Year. The difference between the two is that while some students may still be engaged in educational pursuits (e.g., GED) they are no longer receiving district provided special education services in their new setting, thus they are "exited from special education." However, if they return to school prior to their 21st birthday, their IEP could be reinstated through conducting an updated evaluation.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			99.50%	99.50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.40%	100%	100%	97.80%	97.04%	97.49%	97.36%	97.71%	97.44%	85.80%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			99.50%	99.50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.40%	99.40%	100%	97.50%	97.30%	97.90%	97.77%	98.11%	97.79%	85.68%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	86.78%	87.73%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	87.33%	87.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the Fall of 2011 the U.S. Department of Education offered States the opportunity to request flexibility from certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction. On February 9, 2012 Colorado was granted a Waiver that allows for flexibility from the accountability requirements of ESEA. The Waiver allows Colorado to have a single accountability system and to fully implement Senate Bill 09-163. This legislation established a statewide system of accountability and support requiring aligned annual school and district performance framework reports and annual school and district improvement plans. Stakeholder input was gathered during the drafting of the ESEA waiver and the student participation rate on state assessments was set at 95%. The targets were aligned to the Waiver in FFY 2012.

Update:

Although the State has an approved ESSA Plan, we will update information and provide it in FFY 2019.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	53,660	47,901	87.73%	95.00%	89.27%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
 FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	53,661	47,958	87.75%	95.00%	89.37%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Reporting of the Colorado Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/omas-dataandresults>

Performance results for Colorado's Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on alternate standards can be found on the CDE's website at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltelam>
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltss>
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped_datareports

District or individual school information can be found at:
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped_data
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/colorado_partic_achieve_assess_2017-18

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data page has wrong numbers. The correct data are: ELA Participants=47920, Non-Participants=5858, Participation Rate=89.11% MATH Participants=47958, Non-Participants=5805, Participation Rate=89.20%

A chart with the correct data for this indicator is attached

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			57.50%	58.00%	58.50%	59.00%	57.00%	59.50%	23.86%	28.86%	33.86%
			Data		57.30%	56.90%	57.30%	55.74%	54.07%	53.88%	22.86%	22.62%	22.56%	10.49%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			52.00%	52.50%	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%	53.50%	20.95%	25.95%	30.95%
			Data		52.30%	51.70%	50.60%	48.42%	47.60%	47.20%	19.95%	19.96%	19.50%	8.02%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	33.86%	33.86%
		Data	8.50%	9.02%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	30.95%	30.95%
		Data	6.92%	7.11%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	33.86%	33.86%
Math	A ≥ Overall	30.95%	30.95%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During 2010-2011, examination of trend data led to the recommendation that the targets be lowered for 3C. The targets for 3C were established following review of longitudinal data. Projected targets remained static for one year, and then continued to reflect improvement. The targets for this indicator were set following a stakeholder meeting of local special education directors, representatives from the CSEAC, a representative from the PEAK Parent Center, and the CDE ESSU staff.

During 2013-2014 school year, after discussions with stakeholders took place regarding indicator 3C Targets in relation to the implementation of the new State Assessment in spring of 2015, it was determined that targets will remain static until a new baseline can be established; allowing for new, rigorous and achievable targets to be set at that time. Improvement activities continue to be refined to ensure that teachers in classrooms understand the state standards and learning progressions and improve instruction to support students to demonstrate progress.

Indicator 3 reading proficiency will be the focus of the State Identified Measurable Result. Extensive stakeholder group discussions have, and continue to take place regarding targets and improvement activities.

Please refer to Indicator 17 for additional information.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
------------	--	---	---------------	-----------------	---------------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	47,901	4,777	9.02%	33.86%	9.97%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	47,958	3,541	7.11%	30.95%	7.38%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Reporting of the Colorado Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults>

Performance results for Colorado's Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on alternate standards can be found on the CDE's website at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltelam>
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltss>
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped_datareports

Additional district or individual school information can be found at <http://www.schoolview.org/dish/dish.asp> and <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview>

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2018 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2017.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

To ensure the correction of this noncompliance required by OSEP, the State took the following actions:

- 1) Provided OSEP a Web link that demonstrated that it reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).
- 2) The State posted the data for FFY 2017 SPP/APR at the same location to demonstrate compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).

Weblinks:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped_data

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/colorado_partic_achieve_assess_2017-18

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	3.50%
Data		3.50%	1.80%	0%	0%	3.45%	1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	3.50%	3.50%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.22%	3.22%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Stakeholder Input:

During the 16-17 school year, the Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU) at the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) facilitated discussions about updating the current thresholds in 4A & 4B with the following advisory groups: the Colorado School Mental Health Advisory Council (CO MH), the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) state leadership team at CDE, the Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED) stakeholder group, the Administrative Unit (AU) Special Education Directors' Leadership Team (SDLT), and the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC). Majorities from the CO MH, SDLT, and the CSEAC advisory groups supported the proposed changes, with cautions around state-wide impacts to school discipline such as the Claire Davis Act <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cssrc/claire-davis-school-safety-act>. The SED taskforce appreciated the plan to incorporate supports for AUs, and expressed concern about Special Education Directors' abilities to impact building level administrator's discipline practices. The PBIS leadership team supported a less rigorous threshold for monitoring purposes, but made a commitment to partner in supporting AUs.

Based upon stakeholder feedback, the ESSU amended the original proposed changes to compare AU data to the state rate, which as a result would be more responsive to state-wide changes and legislation that may impact school discipline. A final proposal was provided to the AU Special Education Directors' Leadership Team (SDLT), whereas they stated that they thought that the ESSU did a good job listening to the stakeholders as feedback was well-reflected in the finalized rules, the rules were reasonable, and changes to the thresholds would be enacted.

Ind4A: LEAs >10-day suspension/expulsion rate is significantly discrepant from the state if **its suspension/expulsion rate is more than 4 times of the state's rate for 3 consecutive years (includes 3 annual data collections).**

The stakeholders also made a decision on Indicator 4B: LEA has a significant discrepancy in their >10-day suspension/expulsion rates from the state by race if **1) 5 or more students of a particular racial category received >10-day suspension/expulsion, and that race's suspension/expulsion rate was more than 4 times the state's rate for 3 consecutive years; 2) the policies, practices, and procedures were found problematic.**

Previous Stakeholder Input:

For the development of the 2013-2018 SPP, Stakeholder input was gathered from internal Colorado Department of Education stakeholder groups, including the ESSU and the Office of Learning Supports which includes the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (RTI & PBIS), and the Indicator 4 Team. Longitudinal data was analyzed and targets were proposed. Additionally, representatives from the following groups participated in reviewing data and targets: the Directors of Special Education, the Colorado Special Education Advisory Council (CSEAC), and the Family, School & Community Partnering Community of Practice. Input from stakeholders was recorded and the targets finalized.

Stakeholders discussed longitudinal data and consistent compliance for several years. Also discussed were improvement activities with a continued focused on improving school climate through implementing MTSS as a whole-school, data-driven, prevention-based framework for improving learning outcomes for every student through a layered continuum of evidence-based practices and systems.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	63	0%	3.22%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Colorado identifies an AU as having a "significant discrepancy" if an AU's out-of-school greater-than-10-day suspension/expulsion rate is more than 4 times of the state's out-of-school greater-than-10-day suspension/expulsion rate for 3 consecutive school years.

In SY2016-17, there was no AU whose out-of-school greater-than-10-day suspension/expulsion rates exceeded 4 times of the state's rate.

Three AUs (2 correctional facilities and 1 mental-health facility) were excluded from the calculation of this indicator; they do not participate in the discipline data collection because they cannot suspend/expel the students in their facilities.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.50%	1.80%	0%	0%	3.50%	3.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 40

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	21	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Colorado identifies an AU as having a "significant discrepancy" if 1) 5 or more students of a particular racial category received >10-day out-of-school suspension/expulsion, and that race's suspension/expulsion rate was more than 4 times of the state's rate for 3 consecutive school years; 2) the policies, practices, and procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy

In SY2016-17, 40 AUs were excluded due to not meeting the minimum cell-size of 5 with any of the racial categories.

Three AUs (2 correctional facilities and 1 mental-health facility) were excluded from the calculation of this indicator; they do not participate in the discipline data collection because they cannot suspend/expel the students in their facilities. The seven federal racial categories (i.e., White, Hispanic, Black, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, Asians, and Two or more Races) were examined.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2017 there are 66 Administrative Units. However, since the data for this Indicator is lagged one year, in FFY 2016 there were only 64 Administrative Units. Therefore, there were 40 Administrative Units excluded due to minimum N size and three Administrative Units were excluded because they do not participate in the discipline data collection.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			70.50%	70.70%	70.90%	71.10%	71.30%	71.30%	71.30%	71.30%	71.50%
		Data		70.50%	59.70%	63.10%	67.70%	70.02%	72.04%	72.10%	72.30%	72.11%	72.82%
B	2005	Target ≤			7.70%	7.60%	7.50%	7.40%	7.30%	7.30%	7.30%	7.30%	7.30%
		Data		8.50%	11.20%	11.80%	10.00%	9.20%	8.06%	7.40%	7.20%	7.19%	7.02%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.10%	3.90%	3.90%	3.80%	3.70%	3.60%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%
		Data		3.70%	4.80%	4.20%	3.50%	3.10%	2.95%	3.00%	3.10%	2.63%	2.51%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	71.50%	71.50%
	Data	73.62%	73.56%
B	Target ≤	7.30%	7.30%
	Data	6.68%	6.39%
C	Target ≤	3.50%	3.50%
	Data	2.37%	2.35%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.70%	71.70%
Target B ≤	7.30%	7.20%
Target C ≤	3.50%	3.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2012 multiple discussion took place regarding the least restrictive environment for students with disabilities. After stakeholder groups reviewed trend data and discussed current concerns, the targets were extended for this indicator through FFY 2018. Stakeholders included staff from the ESSU, the Office of Learning Supports, local special education directors, and the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC).

In Colorado, more than two-thirds of students with disabilities are served in the general education classroom for most of the day. The IEP Team takes into account each student's individualized needs when making LRE decisions and the best setting is selected. Longitudinal data indicates a relatively high level of stability over time.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	87,947	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	65,684	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,338	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,603	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	218	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	219	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	65,684	87,947	73.56%	71.70%	74.69%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,338	87,947	6.39%	7.30%	6.07%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,040	87,947	2.35%	3.50%	2.32%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									84.75%	85.50%	85.50%
		Data								84.18%	85.30%	85.26%	86.41%
B	2011	Target ≤									6.20%	6.30%	6.30%
		Data								6.18%	6.10%	6.63%	5.36%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	85.50%	85.75%
	Data	84.48%	86.50%
B	Target ≤	6.30%	6.30%
	Data	5.21%	3.45%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	86.00%	86.25%
Target B ≤	6.20%	6.10%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Colorado is a national leader in inclusive practices for preschool children with disabilities. Since the inception of the preschool special education mandate, the primary model for providing FAPE, including access to the general curriculum, in the LRE for young children with disabilities in Colorado has been a blended preschool classroom approach. These blended classrooms include children from special education, the Colorado Preschool Program (CPP), Title I, Head Start and private pay tuition and may be established and supervised on public school property or as partnerships with private or Head Start Programs. Some sites place or maintain placement of preschoolers with disabilities in community settings on a child by child basis.

The Colorado Preschool Special Education Advisory Committee and the Exceptional Student Services Unit met to establish targets. Knowing that Colorado stakeholders place a high value on inclusion, the research on the efficacy of inclusive preschool programming, and the benefits of providing services within the child's daily routines were a part of the discussion related to new targets. The discussion also included topics related to inclusion, half day and full day preschool opportunities, the inclusion of Kindergarten students in this indicator, and the average number of students being served. The previous two years of data was reviewed and targets were finalized.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	14,293	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	12,486	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	402	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	156	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	12,486	14,293	86.50%	86.00%	87.36%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	559	14,293	3.45%	6.20%	3.91%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2013	Target ≥						77.80%	83.60%	84.10%	84.60%	81.09%	81.09%
		Data					77.30%	83.10%	81.90%	82.40%	82.80%	81.09%	81.34%
A2	2013	Target ≥						76.60%	84.80%	85.30%	85.80%	67.76%	67.76%
		Data					76.10%	84.30%	73.50%	74.30%	72.60%	67.76%	68.55%
B1	2013	Target ≥						76.30%	76.20%	76.70%	77.20%	82.11%	82.11%
		Data					75.80%	75.70%	80.60%	84.80%	83.60%	82.11%	80.62%
B2	2013	Target ≥						71.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.50%	69.34%	69.34%
		Data					71.00%	73.50%	64.00%	74.10%	74.20%	69.34%	69.00%
C1	2013	Target ≥						76.00%	80.30%	80.80%	81.30%	82.08%	82.08%
		Data					75.50%	79.80%	79.30%	80.90%	82.00%	82.08%	77.97%
C2	2013	Target ≥						74.50%	84.70%	85.20%	85.70%	72.12%	72.12%
		Data					74.00%	84.20%	69.40%	77.10%	75.90%	72.12%	71.23%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	81.09%	82.60%
	Data	80.85%	80.44%
A2	Target ≥	67.76%	69.50%
	Data	67.49%	66.30%
B1	Target ≥	82.11%	83.50%
	Data	80.06%	80.62%
B2	Target ≥	69.34%	71.10%
	Data	68.52%	67.90%
C1	Target ≥	82.08%	83.50%
	Data	74.89%	78.19%
C2	Target ≥	72.12%	73.80%
	Data	70.84%	84.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	84.00%	85.30%
Target A2 ≥	71.20%	72.90%
Target B1 ≥	84.90%	86.20%
Target B2 ≥	72.80%	74.40%
Target C1 ≥	84.90%	86.20%
Target C2 ≥	75.40%	77.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

We received consultation from the national DaSy Center, who advised us to use their Meaningful Differences Calculator, and consider realistically how long it might take to see movement in our targets as a result of improvement activities.

We also consulted with the state Preschool Special Ed Advisory Council, Data Specialists in the ESSU, CDE Indicator 7 team members, and Colorado
9/21/2020

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Preschool Program/Results Matter team members.

In five of six summary statements (A1, A2, B1, B2, C2), we have observed overall downward trends in the last few years. For those summary statements, we extrapolated 2014 targets using a logarithmic trend line drawn from the last three years' worth of observed data. We did not extrapolate using earlier data as the quality prior to 2011 was relatively poor.

C1 target was not extrapolated since we have observed a smaller upward trend in the last few years and the same model did not fit.

For the C1 2014 targets, we assumed the 2013 observed data.

Targets for 2014-2016 will remain the same as we do not expect a significant change in outcomes resulting from our improvement activities until 2017. We used the DaSy Center's Meaningful Differences Calculator, which calculates statistically significant differences between two values with a 10% confidence interval. 2017 targets were determined by calculating the threshold for statistically significant differences from 2014 extrapolated targets. N-size was assumed to grow at an annual rate of 1%.

These targets seem ambitious yet realistic considering current national data trends and Colorado's past performance in comparison to the nation, as well as continual improvements in inter-rater reliability among teachers. Targets were presented, discussed, and finalized at the CSEAC stakeholder meeting in November 2014.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4775.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	268.00	5.61%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	602.00	12.61%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	885.00	18.53%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1770.00	37.07%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1250.00	26.18%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2655.00	3525.00	80.44%	84.00%	75.32%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3020.00	4775.00	66.30%	71.20%	63.25%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

A1

Colorado attributes slippage to several programmatic and demographic shifts as well as some changes to the measurement tool itself.

Programmatic and demographic changes include an increase in challenging behaviors among preschoolers (and those children more likely remaining in preschool rather than being suspended/expelled), more accurate identification and monitoring procedures, and increased variability in quality and models of Part C and B services. Colorado recently made significant improvements to its Indicator B7 data collection and warehousing that will allow for richer analysis of these issues in the future.

However, Colorado saw greater-than-usual decreases in Summary Statements 1 and 2 that cannot be wholly attributed to programmatic or demographic shifts. Nearly all states using the GOLD assessment tool to automatically generate Preschool Outcome results saw slippage this year. Teaching Strategies updated their online assessment platform in 2017 to accommodate changes made to the tool itself, which had been expanded up to third grade. Some of these changes, including minor changes to assessment objectives and changes to the front-end look of the online platform, may have impacted 2017 results.

Colorado plans to work with other states using GOLD, the DaSy and ECTA centers, and the GOLD publisher (Teaching Strategies) to develop an analysis plan for determining the root cause of the unexpected summary statement changes and promote solutions to improve data quality for future reporting.

Reasons for A2 Slippage

A2

Colorado attributes slippage to several programmatic and demographic shifts as well as some changes to the measurement tool itself.

Programmatic and demographic changes include an increase in challenging behaviors among preschoolers (and those children more likely remaining in

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

preschool rather than being suspended/expelled), more accurate identification and monitoring procedures, and increased variability in quality and models of Part C and B services. Colorado recently made significant improvements to its Indicator B7 data collection and warehousing that will allow for richer analysis of these issues in the future.

However, Colorado saw greater-than-usual decreases in Summary Statements 1 and 2 that cannot be wholly attributed to programmatic or demographic shifts. Nearly all states using the GOLD assessment tool to automatically generate Preschool Outcome results saw slippage this year. Teaching Strategies updated their online assessment platform in 2017 to accommodate changes made to the tool itself, which had been expanded up to third grade. Some of these changes, including minor changes to assessment objectives and changes to the front-end look of the online platform, may have impacted 2017 results.

Colorado plans to work with other states using GOLD, the DaSy and ECTA centers, and the GOLD publisher (Teaching Strategies) to develop an analysis plan for determining the root cause of the unexpected summary statement changes and promote solutions to improve data quality for future reporting.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	278.00	5.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	476.00	9.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	824.00	17.26%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1991.00	41.70%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1206.00	25.26%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2815.00	3569.00	80.62%	84.90%	78.87%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3197.00	4775.00	67.90%	72.80%	66.95%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

B1

Colorado attributes slippage to some programmatic shifts as well as changes to the measurement tool itself.

Programmatic changes include more accurate identification and monitoring procedures and increased variability in quality and models of Part C and B services. Colorado recently made significant improvements to its Indicator B7 data collection and warehousing that will allow for richer analysis of these issues in the future.

Colorado recently made significant improvements to its Indicator 7 data collection and warehousing that will allow for richer analysis of these issues in the future.

Although the year-over-year change in B1 was not as drastic as A1 and A2, it is also possible that some of the assessment system changes discussed in the A1/A2 slippage narrative impacted B1 results as well.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	298.00	6.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	846.00	17.72%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	837.00	17.53%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1545.00	32.36%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1249.00	26.16%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2382.00	3526.00	78.19%	84.90%	67.56%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2794.00	4775.00	84.30%	75.40%	58.51%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

C1

Outcome C slippage can be attributed to changes in the assessment tool's Preschool Outcomes report algorithm this year. Colorado and a few other states use the GOLD assessment system to automatically generate Preschool Outcomes scores. These states anticipate similar changes. However, Colorado is apparently the only state reporting on Outcome C this year using the new algorithm, while other states plan to use it next year.

Reasons for C2 Slippage

C2

Outcome C slippage can be attributed to changes in the assessment tool's Preschool Outcomes report algorithm this year. Colorado and a few other states use the GOLD assessment system to automatically generate Preschool Outcomes scores. These states anticipate similar changes. However, Colorado is apparently the only state reporting on Outcome C this year using the new algorithm, while other states plan to use it next year.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No
Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

Colorado is one of a few states/territories who use their assessment publishers' online systems to automatically produce OSEP progress categories and summary statements. Ratings are made on the tools' standard objectives which have been cross walked with the Global Child Outcomes 1-3 (please refer to the ECTA Center's Instrument Crosswalk for more detail at <http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/crosswalks.asp>.)

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The online system pulls Outcomes data from the assessment checkpoints corresponding to the preschool IEP entry and exit dates to produce each progress category. The Early Childhood Outcomes Center, in collaboration with assessment publisher researchers and the Colorado Department of Education, have established cut points that are carefully calibrated to reflect children in each progress category. As of 2015-2016, 100% of districts have been using Teaching Strategies GOLD®.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	51.00%	51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%
Data			41.90%	31.70%	45.70%	51.20%	49.50%	43.00%	66.40%	57.32%	62.80%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	54.00%	56.00%
Data	65.29%	66.06%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	58.00%	60.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In May 2011, the CDE brought together a stakeholder group tasked with defining parent involvement in the context of Indicator 8. The stakeholder group included school and district based educational practitioners, representatives from the Parent Training and Information Center, parents of students with disabilities, and state department of education personnel. The meeting was facilitated by the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center.

The stakeholder group defined parent involvement as follows:

In Colorado using the term family emphasizes all primary caretakers, not only parents, who perform essential parental functions in a student's life and also includes the students (Lines, Miller, & Arthur-Stanley, 2011).

Family involvement for improving services and results for children with disabilities means that:

- Students are the center of all problem-solving.
- Family input is actively sought and valued.
- Representation of families from diverse backgrounds is evident at all levels of decision-making at the school and district level.
- All families and stakeholders (e.g., educators, other school staff, administrators, community members, etc.) have access to relevant and useful information in a variety of formats, e.g., meetings, phone calls, emails, interpreted language.
- Effective, ongoing relationships between families and schools are based on mutual trust, respect and acceptance.
- Families and professionals seek to understand and use the different perspectives and experiences they bring to the table.

As a result of this definition, a new survey was developed to better measure Indicator 8 and a new baseline was established for FFY 2011. Based on the analyses of the survey results the survey was adjusted from the original yes/no (i.e., all or nothing) response, to a Likert-based measure. These adjustments were based upon expert consultation outside of the department, input from the ESSU, the Community of Practice for Family, School, and Community Partnerships, and a representative from Colorado's PTI, the PEAK Parent Center and the Indicator 8 Team.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1107.00	1551.00	66.06%	58.00%	71.37%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

23.20%

6685.00

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Via the use of a single survey, distributed by multiple means, e.g., mailings, e-mail/on-line, etc. Colorado randomly samples both preschool and school-age children. Thus, parents of preschool children and parents of school-age children have an equal chance of being selected in the survey sample. For example, in SY2016-17 preschool parents' responses accounted for 10.1% of the received surveys, whereas preschool children accounted for 11.7% of students with disabilities ($z = 0.67, p > .05$). This insignificant difference implies that our survey responses adequately represents the voice of preschool parents.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

A stratified sampling was used, with AU being the stratum. Then, a random sample was drawn from each AU. AUs received a list of 100 randomly chosen students to survey their parents, except for the largest 4 AUs which received a list of 200 students instead. This method makes it possible to reduce sample size required to achieve randomness, while making the proportionate representation in the sample more likely. It also ensures that the department hears from parents from each AU.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

Describe the strategies the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The Exceptional Student Services Unit will provide individual and group technical assistance to Administrative Units especially those of the Denver Metro Region by:

- Setting up face-to-face meetings with special education administrators to review their district's parent survey data.
- Increase awareness of the importance of the surveys and the research behind the importance of parent engagement as a process to better support outcomes for students.
- Identify what supports they may need to increase parent survey return rate from all demographic groups.
- Provide survey return rate data to the special education directors every two months and offer assistance as needed

During the face-to-face meetings, Directors of special education will also be encouraged to:

- Review the parent surveys with district staff, principals, child study team, instructional staff including general and special education teachers, to anticipate parent responses and identify areas to work on this year related to parent involvement.
- Reflect and improve upon current AU practices to increase response rates of parent involvement from the identified demographic groups
- Inform families regarding the purpose of the survey and highlight the importance of their participation.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

For the 2017-18 parent survey, Colorado distributed 6686 surveys to parents by using a stratified sampling with the Administrative Unit (AU) as the stratum. Out of the 6686 surveys distributed to parents, 1555 (23%) responded to the survey. However, 4 of them did not answer a sufficient number of questions (fewer than 13 out of 16 questions), thus were excluded from the analyses.

Representativeness analyses were applied to gender, disability category, race/ethnicity, grade, and geographic location. The table below summarizes the results of the "tests of proportionate difference" for these categories. The column "Representative" indicates whether or not the given group's representation among the survey respondents was significantly different, based on z-tests, from the group's representation among special education population in Colorado. These analyses indicated that each gender was represented proportionately among the survey respondents. Each disability category was represented proportionately as well, except for Specific Learning Disability which was under-represented among the survey respondents. Each racial/ethnic group was also represented proportionately except for parents of White students who were over-represented among the survey respondents. Each grade was represented proportionately among the survey respondents. An area of concern with regards to representativeness from the current analyses was the lack of geographical representation. The table shows, 5 out of 8 regions were disproportionate to the population. More specifically, the over-representation in most of these regions seemed to have stemmed from the significant under-representation of parents from the Denver Metro region among the survey respondents. The Denver Metro Region accounted for over 55% of the special education population in the state, however, this region only had a response rate of 25.6%. There are 4 large AUs in the Denver metro region and all of their response rates were lower than the state's overall response rate. Other AUs in the Denver metro region also struggled with the survey response rates – out of 18 AUs in the Denver metro region, only 4 exceeded the State's response rate. Supporting AUs in the Denver metro region might not only increase response rate from parents in this region but also increase responses rates from the low represented groups.

	Population Representation	Survey Respondents	Difference	Is It Representative
Child's Gender				
Male	66.00%	64.00%	-2.00%	Yes
Female	34.00%	36.00%	2.00%	Yes

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Child's Disability

Intellectual Disability	6.00%	7.61%	1.61%	Yes
Specific Learning Disability	39.47%	33.27%	-6.20%	No
Speech or Language Impairment	19.01%	21.41%	2.40%	Yes
Developmental Delay	9.86%	10.32%	0.46%	Yes
Autism Spectrum Disorders	7.11%	9.03%	1.92%	Yes
Other Health Impairment	10.38%	10.32%	-0.06%	Yes
Others	8.20%	8.06%	-0.14%	Yes

Child's Race/Ethnicity

American Indian	1.01%	0.39%	-0.62%	Yes
Asian	1.80%	1.55%	-0.26%	Yes
Black	5.54%	2.45%	-3.09%	Yes
Hispanic	37.22%	35.78%	-1.43%	Yes
White	50.24%	56.93%	6.69%	No
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.17%	0.13%	-0.04%	Yes
Two or More Races	4.02%	2.77%	-1.25%	Yes

Child's Grade

Preschool	10.11%	11.73%	1.63%	Yes
Half Day K	1.42%	1.81%	0.38%	Yes
Full Day K	5.09%	6.90%	1.81%	Yes
Grade 1	6.67%	7.48%	0.81%	Yes
Grade 2	7.35%	7.80%	0.45%	Yes
Grade 3	7.95%	7.54%	-0.40%	Yes
Grade 4	8.31%	10.12%	1.82%	Yes
Grade 5	8.55%	7.09%	-1.46%	Yes
Grade 6	8.35%	8.90%	0.54%	Yes
Grade 7	8.06%	7.09%	-0.97%	Yes
Grade 8	7.83%	7.03%	-0.80%	Yes
Grade 9	7.59%	6.32%	-1.28%	Yes
Grade 10	6.80%	5.61%	-1.20%	Yes
Grade 11	5.91%	4.58%	-1.34%	Yes

Child's AU Region

Denver Metro	55.13%	25.60%	-29.54%	No
North Central	13.29%	25.60%	12.31%	No
Northeast	2.15%	4.06%	1.91%	Yes
Northwest	3.66%	10.77%	7.11%	No
Pikes Peak	17.52%	21.47%	3.95%	No
Southeast	1.48%	6.25%	4.77%	No

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Southwest	2.76%	4.13%	1.36%	Yes
West Central	4.01%	2.13%	-1.88%	Yes

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.80%		0%	1.70%	0%	0%	3.40%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 3

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	63	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

1. the calculation method(s) being used
Weighted risk ratio method

2. the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified.
3.0 and above

3. the number of years of data used in the calculation
1 year

4. minimum cell and/or n-sizes
minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30
minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

Three AUs (2 correctional facilities and 1 mental-health facility) were excluded from the calculation of this indicator due to not meeting the minimum n-size in any of the racial categories.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

None of the AUs exceeded the weighted risk ratio threshold while meeting the minimum cell/n-sizes, thus, none was investigated for inappropriate identification for Indicator 9 purposes.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.80%		0%	1.70%	1.70%	5.17%	6.90%	1.70%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 4

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	62	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

1. the calculation method(s) being used
 Weighted risk ratio method

2. the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified.
 3.0 and above

3. the number of years of data used in the calculation
 1 year

4. minimum cell and/or n-sizes
 minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10
 minimum n (risk denominator) size = 10

Four AUs (2 correctional facilities, 1 mental-health facility, and 1 school for deaf and blind) were excluded from the calculation of this indicator due to not meeting the minimum cell/n-size.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

None of the AUs exceeded the weighted risk ratio threshold while meeting the minimum cell and n-sizes, thus, none was investigated for inappropriate identification for Indicator 10 purposes.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		84.60%	87.10%	92.60%	95.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	97.83%	97.90%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.91%	98.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
22,007	21,573	98.00%	100%	98.03%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	434
---	-----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Out of the 434 children whose evaluations were not completed within the timeline, the shortest number of days beyond the timeline was 1 day and the longest was 318 days. The median number of days beyond the timeline was 10 days.

We do not require reasons of delay beyond specifications under 34 CFR §300.301(d).

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Overview:

The Special Education End-of-Year Student collection is required to obtain data on students who were referred, evaluated, or received services in the Administrative Unit or State Operated Program throughout the school year. Also reported is information about students who received services in an eligible facility or an in-state/out-of-state non-public school program or public agency. Every year, the reporting period for this collection is between July 1st through June 30th. The data received is used to fulfill data reporting required by Federal and State law.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

There is one snapshot performed for Special Education End of Year. The data from the end of year snapshot is analyzed to ensure it is error free in order to determine which Administrative Unit (AU) will be included in our General Supervision and Monitoring activities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State verified that each Administrative Unit 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Root cause analyses of non-compliance revealed that no systemic issues were found with the exception of one AU. To verify that each AU is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320, the CDE reviewed updated data that was subsequently collected through the State data system using the same strategies employed to identify any noncompliance. The above AU found to be non-compliant has entered into tier 2 of our differentiated monitoring and support. Please refer to introduction for more information about tiered levels of support provided by the State.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data			96.10%	92.60%	95.00%	99.00%	100%	99.00%	99.00%	98.23%	97.16%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.01%	96.89%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,493
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	643
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,131
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	595
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	86
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	2,131	2,169	96.89%	100%	98.25%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	38
--	----

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Out of the 38 children whose IEPs were implemented after their 3rd birthdays, the shortest number of days beyond the 3rd birthday was 2 days and the longest was 264 days. The median number of days beyond the 3rd birthday was 9.5 days.

We do not require reasons of delay beyond specifications under 34 CFR §300.301(d).

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Local early childhood systems have continued to refine their transition processes and procedures to achieve timely transitions, create plans with all necessary steps and services included, notify the LEA so as to enable them to be part of the planning process and documenting the process. All local Early Childhood interagency groups have written transition agreements which include policy and procedures for timelines, notification, transition planning and plans. They are all aware and informed of the requirements for 100% compliance targets.

Currently data for Indicator 12 are reported by every AU through the online Special Education End-of-Year data collection. The data elements and definitions with the relevant information for Indicator 12 are defined as: Child’s Date of Birth, Date of Parental Consent to Evaluate, Date of Initial Eligibility Meeting, Date IEP was Implemented, and Reason for delay in implementing IEP.

AUs report data for all children who were served in a Part C program and evaluated for Part B services. When the IEP was not implemented by the child’s third birthday a reason for delay is provided.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State verified that each Administrative Unit 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Root cause analyses of non-compliance revealed that no systemic issues were found with the exception of one AU. To verify that the AU is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320, the CDE reviewed updated data that was subsequently collected through the State data system using the same strategies employed to identify any noncompliance. The AU found to be non-compliant has entered into tier 2 of our differentiated monitoring and support. Please refer to introduction for more information about tiered levels of support provided by the State.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						83.90%	89.00%	86.20%	90.00%	92.41%	70.94%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	93.45%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
396	425	100%	100%	93.18%

Reasons for Slippage

Slippage was due to the fact that five of Colorado's AUs did not meet 100% compliance for Indicator 13. These AUs received technical assistance and support through side-by-side reviews of their IEPs by the Secondary Transition Team. The Secondary Transition Team also provided targeted support through staff professional development in writing Secondary Transition IEPs based on areas of need identified through file reviews. Previous year FFY2016, all of the AUs receiving technical assistance followed the guidance given and corrected their files to 100%.

In FFY 2017, five AUs given the opportunity to correct their files did not. AUs who self report less than 100% compliance for Indicator 13 in a given year and do not correct non-compliance within the current school year are not issued findings but are required to participate in side-by-side reviews the following year.

Additionally, the State verifies that each Administrative Unit 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Root cause analyses of non-compliance revealed that no systemic issues were found with the exception of one AU. To verify the AU is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), the CDE reviewed updated data that was subsequently collected through the State data system using the same strategies employed to identify any noncompliance. The above AU found to be non-compliant has entered into tier 2 of our differentiated monitoring and support. Please refer to introduction for more information about tiered levels of support provided by the State.

When child-specific noncompliance is found, the AU is required to make immediate correction(s), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU. The CDE verifies corrections through a student record review in a desk audit.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Annually, CDE conducts review of transition IEPs by tasking AUs to self-audit their transition IEPs independently and by conducting face-to-face or virtual

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

transition IEP reviews in partnership with AUs. Prior to the school year, CDE randomly select students of transition age for AUs to review. AUs' assigned number of IEPs to review vary between 5 and 10, depending on the student population size in the AU. AUs are required to self-review the selected IEPs by a due date within the Exceptional Student Services (ESSU) Data Management System (DMS), a web-based tool developed to provide AUs with a secure web-based location for managing and monitoring all business required for the implementation of IDEA. DMS prompts teams to review the transition IEPs using NTACT's Indicator 13 review checklist. Some AUs are required to conduct the transition IEP reviews in partnership with CDE rather than self-reviewing When AUs are in the following circumstances:

1. New AUs are required to participate in side-by-side Indicator 13 IEP reviews in the year they are established.
2. AUs who self-report less than 100% compliance for Indicator 13 in a given year are required to participate in side-by-side reviews the following year.
3. AUs who are selected to participate in the general supervision/monitoring visits are required to participate in side-by-side reviews.

All transition IEP review results are compiled on the due date to determine the level of state's and each AU's compliance with Indicator 13.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? Yes No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							31.50%	32.00%	32.50%	32.50%	32.50%
		Data						31.10%	40.00%	28.00%	26.40%	27.18%	24.62%
B	2009	Target ≥							58.00%	59.50%	61.00%	61.00%	61.00%
		Data						56.20%	64.00%	71.00%	50.90%	74.21%	56.43%
C	2009	Target ≥							63.00%	66.00%	69.00%	69.00%	69.00%
		Data						60.20%	67.00%	81.00%	56.60%	83.33%	73.60%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	32.50%	32.75%
	Data	25.63%	26.10%
B	Target ≥	61.00%	61.25%
	Data	60.44%	61.85%
C	Target ≥	69.00%	69.25%
	Data	77.48%	74.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.75%	33.00%
Target B ≥	61.25%	61.50%
Target C ≥	69.25%	69.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 14 data was presented to stakeholders at a Re-invent Special Education meeting, representing Directors of Special Education, Peak Parent, CSEAC, Higher Education, ESSU consultants and the Leadership team. The discussions primarily focused on trend data and current goals. This was followed by another stakeholder meeting in August 2014 where there were additional discussion regarding the vendor contracted by CDE as well as consideration of changes regarding who would be making the phone calls to graduates one year after graduating from high school. Additional discussions continued with Directors and Transition Coordinators throughout the fall of 2014.

The decision was made to have targets remain static for two additional years, with incremental increases through FFY 2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2000.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	542.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	832.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	82.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	136.00

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	542.00	2000.00	26.10%	32.75%	27.10%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1374.00	2000.00	61.85%	61.25%	68.70%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1592.00	2000.00	74.80%	69.25%	79.60%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Depending on the n size, Colorado uses a combination of census population and stratified sampling for indicator 14 data collection. In the census population sample, Administrative Units (AUs) with 100 or fewer students who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school were interviewed. For the stratified sample, AUs with 100-200 students exiting, received a list of 100 randomly selected former students to interview. AUs with more than 200 special ed exiters received a list of 200 randomly selected former students to interview. If the AU wishes to interview all former students rather than a sample the state accommodates for that.

Colorado had 5,009 secondary school exiters with IEPs in SY 2016-17, out of them, 3,718 were selected as interviewees, following the methodology described above. Out of the 3,718 former students, 38 were found to be deceased or returned to high schools. Out of the remaining 3,680 students, 2,000 students participated in the interview. This resulted in a 40% state participation rate.

The use of Colorado's sampling methodology made it possible to reduce the sample size required to achieve randomness and made the proportionate representation in the sample more likely to yield valid and reliable estimates.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Representativeness analyses were applied to gender, disability categories, race/ethnicity, reason for exiting secondary schools, and geographic location in the State. In the table the "Representative" column indicates whether or not the demographic categories among the interviewed respondents represented the population adequately according to a two-proportion z-test for each sub category (e.g., Asian) and a Chi-Square test for each overall category (e.g., race overall). As shown in the table both genders among the interviewed respondents represented the population adequately. However, disability categories did not represent the population adequately overall, due to the under representation of former students with serious emotional disability among the interviewed respondents. Racial categories did not represent the population adequately overall due to the under representation of Hispanic students and over representation of White students in the interviewed respondents. Reasons for exiting secondary school did not represent the population adequately overall due to the over-representation of former students who received regular high school diploma and under-representation of those who dropped out. Lastly, geographic location of the interviewed respondents did not represent the former student population adequately. Both significant and non-significant over-representations in most Colorado regions seem to have stemmed from the large under-representation in the Denver Metro region. Many AUs in the Denver Metro region struggled to reach the former students for a number of reasons. For example, Colorado has seen a moderate negative correlation between the size of the former student population and the participation rate in the post-school outcome interview, such that the smaller the exit population of the AU, the more former students participate in the interviews. Denver metro region, which consisted of many large-sized AUs, confirmed this trend during the current school year.

	Population Representation	Interviewed Representation	Difference	Representative?
Gender				
Male	65.1%	64.2%	-0.9%	Yes

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Female	34.9%	35.8%	0.9%	Yes
Gender Overall	-	-	-	Yes
Disability				
Specific Learning Disability	56.6%	54.8%	-1.8%	Yes
Other Health Impairment	12.6%	13.7%	1.1%	Yes
Serious Emotional Disability	10.5%	8.8%	-1.7%	No
Autism Spectrum Disorders	6.0%	7.2%	1.2%	Yes
Intellectual or Multiple Disability	9.1%	10.6%	1.5%	Yes
Hearing Impairment	1.7%	1.6%	-0.1%	Yes
Others	3.5%	3.5%	-0.1%	Yes
Disability Overall	-	-	-	No
Race				
Native American	1.2%	0.8%	-0.4%	Yes
Asian	1.8%	1.5%	-0.3%	Yes
African American	7.7%	5.9%	-1.8%	No
Hispanic	36.4%	32.7%	-3.7%	No
Pacific Islander	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	Yes
Two or more race	3.2%	3.5%	0.3%	Yes
White	49.5%	55.4%	5.8%	No
Race Overall	-	-	-	No
Reason for exiting secondary schools				
Received a regular diploma	76.9%	84.7%	7.8%	No

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Dropped Out	19.7%	11.3%	-8.4%	No
Reached Maximum Age	1.9%	2.3%	0.4%	Yes
Received Certificate	1.5%	1.7%	0.2%	Yes
Exit Reason Overall	-	-	-	No
Region				
Denver Metro	58.9%	43.6%	-15.1%	No
North Central	11.9%	16.5%	4.6%	No
Northeast	1.7%	3.2%	1.5%	Yes
Northwest	3.8%	4.5%	0.7%	Yes
Pikes Peak	16.2%	24.1%	7.9%	No
Southeast	1.4%	1.9%	.5%	Yes
Southwest	2.8%	2.5%	-.3%	Yes
West Central	3.6%	3.9%	.3%	Yes
Region Overall	-	-	-	No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The Denver metro region was notably under-represented among the interviewed former students. The Denver metro region accounted for 58.9% of the IEP exiter population, while it represented only 43.6% of the interviewed former students (-15%). Denver metro region contained many AUs with large exiter population, however, 9 out of 17 Denver metro region AUs did not reach the State's participation rate of 54%. Furthermore, 4 of them were among largest AUs with 200+ IEP exiters that were not successful in making contact with the former students. This impacted the participation rate from the Denver Metro region. This factor may have also resulted in unrepresentation of African American and Hispanic students. African American under-representation has improved from 35% participation rate in 2015 to 52% in 2018, however, Hispanic former students' participation continues to be a concern. Given these results, increasing interview participation among former students who exited from the Denver metro region will be a focus for Colorado in the next school year.

We will provide training to all districts regarding strategies for increasing response rates for all demographic groups. We also plan to convene AUs in the Denver Metro region to discuss strategies on improving response rates from Hispanic, African American, and students who dropped out. The 3 AUs from the Denver Metro region that have been successful in obtaining responses from these groups of students will be invited to discuss barriers and share the strategies they employ. Additionally, we will provide targeted TA for those AUs identified in the analysis of the data that have lowerer response rates.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%
Data		100%	42.90%	54.55%	45.50%	62.50%	80.00%	55.56%	85.71%	60.00%	83.33%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	50.00%	51.00%
Data	50.00%	62.50%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	52.00%	53.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were re-established and extended for this indicator through FFY 2018 following a stakeholder meeting of local special education directors, special education service providers, parents of students with disabilities in Colorado, and the state PTI (PEAK Parent Center). This stakeholder group reviewed trend data and set the targets based upon discussions around the fact that there is no mediator present at Resolution Sessions. The outcome of this measure is based on the disposition of the parties at the table and therefore there is little ability by CDE to affect the outcome of this indicator.

The CDE is engaged in educating parties about resolution sessions and collecting data on when the resolution session occurred and if agreement was reached.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	11	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
6	11	62.50%	52.00%	54.55%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			66.00%	66.00%	72.00%	75.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Data		88.00%	81.80%	79.16%	57.70%	63.64%	70.60%	81.82%	75.00%	62.86%	60.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	61.00%	62.00%
Data	72.73%	65.52%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	63.00%	64.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were re-established and extended for this indicator through FFY 2018 following a stakeholder meeting of local special education directors, special education service providers, parents of students with disabilities in Colorado, and the state PTI (PEAK Parent Center). Mediation is made available at no cost to parties who have disputes involving any matter under Part B. Mediation is a voluntary process on the part of the parties and is not used to deny or delay any of the parent's rights under Part B. If a mediation agreement is reached, it is reduced to writing in the form of a binding mediation agreement which is enforceable in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	13	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	21	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	54	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
13	21	54	65.52%	63.00%	62.96%

Reasons for Slippage

For this reporting period, the mediation agreement rate was .04% below the state's target of 63%. The mediation agreement rate decreased from 65.52% in FFY 2016 down to 62.96% in FFY 2017, a total of 2.56 percentage points, evidencing slippage. There are two primary reasons for this slippage: 1) changes to the state mediation system, and 2) a significant increase in the number of mediations related to due process. In December of 2017, the state was required to make changes to its pool of IDEA mediators, transitioning from the use of administrative law judges to independent contractors.

Although our independent contractors are experienced mediators with knowledge of special education, most of them use a less evaluative approach to mediation that has likely impacted the rate of agreement. Additionally, the state has experienced a 44% increase in mediations related to due process. National data indicate that mediations related to due process are less likely to result in written agreements than mediations unrelated to due process. Consistent with national trends, Colorado's agreement rate was 56.52% for due process related mediation and 67.74% for mediation unrelated to due process. Combined, we believe these factors have impacted our mediation agreement rate for indicator 16. Colorado has engaged in the following activity to improve

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

our mediation system, with a focus on improving agreement rates: 1) professional development was provided to our contractors by a national trainer of special education mediators on 10/30/18, 2) CDE staff consulted with the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) for technical assistance in the areas of outreach and evaluation of mediation services in March of 2018, and 3) the CDE is in the process of improving data collection related to our mediation system with the intent of improving agreement rates. For example, the CDE is in the process of contracting with a specialist in mediation to develop a better mediation intake and evaluation tool to collect data that can be used to analyze factors related to impasse, if any. The results would be used to provide targeted professional development to our mediators with the intent of improving the agreement rate.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥				19.00%	18.50%
Data					

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	18.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Fran Herbert

Title: Supervisor, RDA

Email: herbert_f@cde.state.co.us

Phone: 303-866-6604