

# CO Part B

## FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

**Annual Performance Report Updates:**

Added the Facilitated IEP Early Dispute Resolution Process to the General Supervision section on Introduction page.

Stakeholder involment in determining threshold changes for Indicator 4A & 4B.

Updated thresholds for Indicator 4A & 4B.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

64

**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 ESSU provides leadership, resources, support, and accountability for 64 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 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 resulsts 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.

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 though 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

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- 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 disaggregation 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:**

- 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:**

- IDEA Part B and Preschool Narratives and Budgets
- Fiscal End of Year reporting
- AUs' self-audits and data analyses conducted via the ESSU Data Management System
- 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

### **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 Statewide Data Management System to analyze trends in the following areas:**

- Performance data at the state and local level
- Student record reviews to ensure compliance of the SPP Indicators
- Family School engagement data gathered through the state's parent survey
- Fiscal policies and procedures
- Some AUs may participate in drill down improvement activities when data indicate potential concern. For Indicators 4, 9 and 10, when disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is reported, the AU must engage in a deeper analysis to ascertain whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate policies, procedures and practices.

### **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.

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

### **Tier 1 - Universal Support**

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

### **Tier 2 - Tailored 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 - Customized 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 2016):**

- 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 2016 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 a voluntary process on the part of the parties and may not be used to deny or delay any of the parent's rights under Part B. If a mediation agreement is reached, it is reduced to a written settlement agreement enforceable in any court of competent jurisdiction.

In July of 2010, the CDE moved from independent mediators to an Interagency Agreement with the State Department of Personnel and Administration, Office of Administrative Courts (OAC) for mediators to conduct all of Colorado's IDEA mediations. Pursuant to the Interagency Agreement, OAC typically conducts mediations within 30 days, provides the CDE with an outcome tracking report for data purposes, and supplies the parties with mediation evaluation forms. However, on September 1, 2017, the OAC notified the CDE that they would no longer be scheduling or conducting IDEA mediations (this notice triggered a 90 day termination period). Beginning December 1, 2017 the Department is transitioning mediation services to independent contract mediators until the end of the fiscal year 2018. During this transition the CDE will determine an alternate method of providing mediation services beginning July 1, 2018.

CDE actively encourages parties to consider resolving their disputes through mediation. Such encouragement is typically provided 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. When encouraging parties to consider mediation, the dispute resolution consultant makes clear that mediation may not be used to deny or delay any of the rights available under Part B; however, the parties may jointly request that a due process hearing or a state complaint investigation be held in abeyance for a reasonable period of time until the mediation is completed. When CDE receives a request for mediation, the responsible dispute resolution consultant confirms that both parties are voluntarily agreeing to mediation and then assigns a mediator to the case.

Upon agreement of the parties, the SCO or ALJ may extend the time for issuing a final decision to allow the Parties to engage in mediation. If there is no agreement or partial agreement, the state complaint investigation or due process hearing resumes to address the remaining allegations. If the parties resolve their disputes through a written and binding mediation agreement or some other method, the parties notify the SCO (in the case of a state complaint) or the 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.

CDE does not identify compliance issues involved in disputes that are mediated and ultimately resolved due to the confidential nature of the mediation process. It is presumed that such issues are unique to each individual case and are not systemic in nature.

#### **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 that the complaint is being accepted for investigation or rejected. 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 content requirements, and (3) 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 complaint must be resolved within sixty (60) calendar days of the date of its filing, 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. 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. 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 must contain findings of fact and conclusions of law.

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 remedy 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 placed in the AU's monitoring file and serves 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 licensed 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:**

The CDE contracts with the State Department of Personnel and Administration, Office of Administrative Courts (OAC) and their administrative law judges (ALJs) conduct all of Colorado's IDEA due process hearings. Per the Interagency Agreement with OAC, the ESSU's dispute resolution team tracks the ALJ's compliance with applicable timelines, and receives a copy of the ALJ's decision for publication. The ESSU also provides the ALJs with trainings provided by the CDE or by qualified trainers/presenters in the area of special education law, including at the CDE's annual 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 finds the AU to be in violation, the decision is made available to the General Supervision Team, and is placed in the AU's monitoring file and serves as a data source for monitoring. The ESSU does not require an AU found to be in violation to take corrective action, as the ALJ's decision awards appropriate remedies. The ESSU does monitor 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 Early Dispute Resolution Project through CDE supports neutral IEP facilitation, which is a preventative approach that provides support for: resolving conflict, bringing the team to consensus on issues, and completing a mutually agreed upon 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 statewide 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. Volunteers through nonprofit agencies who are also certified in IEP facilitation work with CDE in meeting the needs across the state. 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 statewide IEP facilitator, a parent or a district submits a request to CDE, an agreement by both parties is secured, then a facilitator is assigned. The facilitator will then contact both parties to set the meeting data and time, 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.

#### **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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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. (See attached or [http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/cip\\_understandingdeterminations](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/cip_understandingdeterminations) for more information)

### Tier 1 - Universal Support for those who Meet Requirements

AU demonstrates:

- 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.

### Tier 2 - Tailored 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.

### Tier 3 - Customized 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.

### 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.

Effective March 30, 2016, newly aligned Rules of Regulation for Educator Preparation and Licensing have been adopted, affecting certain licensing endorsements in Colorado, including the Special Education Generalist. Please view the Endorsement Fact Sheet (see attachment) for a brief summary of the major changes and schedule for implementation.

High quality, initial preparation of practitioners is important, as is the continuing enhancement of skills and knowledge required of teachers in the field. The CDE ESSU provides professional development and/or technical assistance 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). Administrative Unit partners (consultants in the ESSU) apprise the Professional

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Development Team and content specialists about needs that they see in the districts and BOCES. 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-language pathologists, school psychologists, etc.)

Additional information gleaned from the work of the General Supervision Continuous Improvement Process helps focus professional development offerings for service providers through the layered continuum of support. This process ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based PD to the Administrative Units (AU). The AU self audits, ESSU's needs analyses, and trend data analyses from indicator reviews, guide the provision of professional development activities to address gaps in knowledge and introduce emerging evidence-based strategies in order to continue to build system capacity to improve results for students with disabilities.

As one of the coherent improvement strategies of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, the ESSU in collaboration with 3 Institutes of Higher Education, are working to improve alignment the pre-service education with an induction model and on-going professional development of licensed educators in K-3 literacy. Additional information is available in the SSIP.

### 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 amde 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 matrix is expected in Spring of 2017. A draft of the marix (vesrion 1.0) is attached.

Now that we are further into the shift towards focusing on results, we are planning to hold several diverse stakeholder meetings to re-evaluate our results targets during 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 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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-servs. 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/cdesped/sped\\_datareports](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped_datareports)

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

--



# FFY 2016 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: 2011

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
Target ≥	80.00%
Data	53.78%

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Beginning in June 2012, the Colorado Department of Education met with members of the following stakeholder groups for assistance as the new high school graduation guideline recommendations were developed and considered by the State Board of Education. The graduation targets were established with input from a variety of stakeholders from the following groups: Admission and Transfer Policy Review Task Force (Colorado Department of Higher Education), Colorado Association of School Boards (CASB), Colorado BOCES, Colorado Community College System, Colorado Council on High Schools & College Relations (CCHSCR), Colorado Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU), Colorado School Counselor Association (CSCA), Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee, Colorado Workforce Development Council, Colorado Association of School Executives (CASE), Education Success Task Force, Emily Griffith Technical College, Graduation Guidelines Advisory Council, Post Workforce Readiness Endorsed Diploma work group (CDHE), Remedial Education Policy Review task force (CDHE), State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education, Colorado Education Association (CEA), District Superintendents, Westminster High School, Adams 50 School District.

These stakeholders emphasized the goal for all students earning a high school diploma to 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. This expectation includes students with disabilities, which is both a rigorous and challenging goal. The targets reflected for FFY 2013-2018 encompasses the 4 year “on-time” graduation cohort for all Colorado students as required by OSEP.


Colorado’s 80% graduation target rate was set for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Colorado Department of Education’s, Federal Programs Unit with extensive stakeholder input. However under State accountability, districts are allowed to reach an 80% target for all students using the best of their 4-year, 5-year, 6-year, or 7-year rates. Additionally, there were specific targets also set at that time for students with disabilities using a six-year cohort.

Under the U.S. Department of Education’s interpretation of the ESEA Title I regulations, States are allowed to propose a method for accurately accounting for students who legitimately take longer than the standard number of years to graduate. High School students with disabilities have more options available to them as they move towards graduation and it may take them additional time to complete their requirements. Additionally, Colorado’s transition program, designed to continue the education for students with disabilities who need additional time to complete requirements, is typically implemented during the student’s fifth, sixth, and seventh year of high school.

In Colorado, students who legitimately take longer to graduate, are included in a five, six, or seven-year cohort graduation rate depending upon the final completion date. Colorado graduation targets for students with disabilities are reported in the Colorado Strategic Performance Plan (pg.19) which is attached and also available at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdecomm/cdeperformanceplan> These graduation targets, established with the input from the stakeholders listed above, are set based upon a six year cohort.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	3,663	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	6,399	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	57.24%	Calculate 

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
3,663	6,399	53.78%	80.00%	57.24%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

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.

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 2015 response

none

# FFY 2016 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
Target ≤	25.20%
Data	23.02%

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	25.20%	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>

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

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 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	3,900	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	49	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	61	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	1,244	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e )</a>	13	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,244	5,267	23.02%	25.20%	23.62%

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

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	86.78%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	87.33%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	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.

For more information regarding Colorado's Waiver, please go to: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/NCLBWaiver.asp>

Update:

With the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, statewide stakeholder groups have been meeting to develop a new state plan. Updated information will be provided in FFY 2016.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) Date: 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	7671	7909	7959	7576	7317	7035	n	n	n	n	6650
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2910	2671	2526	2311	2151	2083					1749
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3567	3951	4078	3858	3546	3265					2883
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	539	584	601	602	649	620					577

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) Date: 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	7667	7908	7963	7580	7320	7035	n	n	n	n	6647
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1434	1264	1188	1454	1354	1390					1499
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5060	5364	5422	4724	4335	3958					3124
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	539	583	600	604	649	617					575

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	52,117	45,721	86.78%	95.00%	87.73%

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	52,120	45,737	87.33%	95.00%	87.75%

## 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: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults">http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults</a>
Performance results for Colorado's Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on modified achievement standards can be found on the CDE's website at: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/coalt-englishmath-dataandresults">http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/coalt-englishmath-dataandresults</a>
Additional district or individual school information can be found at <a href="http://www.schoolview.org/dish/dish.asp">http://www.schoolview.org/dish/dish.asp</a> and <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview">http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview</a>

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none



FFY 2016 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
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	33.86%
		Data	8.50%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	30.95%
		Data	6.92%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	33.86%	33.86%	33.86%
Math	A ≥ Overall	30.95%	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.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	7016	7206	7205	6771	6346	5968	n	n	n	n	5209
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	400	404	344	195	200	172					97
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	120	187	187	155	149	121					109
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	108	136	194	169	240	243					192

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	7033	7211	7210	6782	6338	5965	n	n	n	n	5198
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	425	290	242	162	131	143					95
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	303	200	203	159	103	121					115
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	102	128	89	70	46	69					56

## FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	45,721	4,122	8.50%	33.86%	9.02%

## FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	45,737	3,252	6.92%	30.95%	7.11%

## 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: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults">http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults</a>
Performance results for Colorado's Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on modified achievement standards can be found on the CDE's website at: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/coalt-englishmath-dataandresults">http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/coalt-englishmath-dataandresults</a>
Additional district or individual school information can be found at <a href="http://www.schoolview.org/dish/dish.asp">http://www.schoolview.org/dish/dish.asp</a> and <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview">http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview</a>

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 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: 2005

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
Target ≤	3.50%
Data	0%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.50%	3.22%	3.22%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Current Stakeholder Input

During the 16-17 school year, the ESSU 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 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 Sped 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 the state rate for 3 consecutive data collections.



Ind4B: 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 data collections; 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 2016 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 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2016
3/16/2018				

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		Data*	Target*	Data
0	64	0%	3.50%	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 suspension/expulsion rate is more than 4 times of the state’s rate for 3 consecutive school years.

### ☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Colorado identifies an AU as having a “significant discrepancy” if an AU’s out-of-school suspension/expulsion rate is more than 4 times of the state’s rate for 3 consecutive data collections. The state’s suspension/expulsion rate for FFY2016 was 0.72%, which made the discrepancy threshold 2.88%. No AU exceeded 2.88% for FFY2016, thus no AU was significantly discrepant in Indicator 4A.

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 2015 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 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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.

No AU was significantly discrepant in Indicator 4A during 2015-2016, therefore a review of policies, procedures, and practices were conducted during FFY 2016.

- ☒ 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 2015

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 2016 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: 2009

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
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

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 in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	64	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.

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)

Although Colorado does not set a minimum N size (i.e., the number of students with disabilities of the particular race in the AU), we do set a minimum cell-size of five (i.e., the number of students with disabilities of the particular race who received >10-day out-of-school suspension/expulsion in the AU).

We do not calculate the rate ratio for the AU unless 5 or more students of a particular racial category received >10-day out-of-school suspension/expulsion. 18 AUs met this criteria. Out of these 18 AUs, 3 AUs' suspension/expulsion rate was more than 4 times of the state's rate for the first time in FFY 2016. Since Colorado does not identify the AU as being significantly discrepant unless they exceed the threshold for 3 consecutive school years, these 3 AUs are not yet significantly discrepant. However, the State has already begun providing technical assistance to these 4 AUs.

Current Stakeholder Input

During the 16-17 school year, the ESSU 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 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 Sped 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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
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: LEA's >10-day suspension/expulsion rate is significantly discrepant from the state if **its suspension/expulsion rate is more than 4 times the state rate for 3 consecutive data collections.**

Ind4B: 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 data collections; 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 (Rtl & 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.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 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 2015 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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.

No AU was significantly discrepant in Indicator 4B during 2015-2016, therefore a review of policies, procedures, and practices were conducted during FFY 2016.

- ☒ 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 2015**

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 2016 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
A	Target ≥	71.50%
	Data	73.62%
B	Target ≤	7.30%
	Data	6.68%
C	Target ≤	3.50%
	Data	2.37%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.50%	71.70%	71.70%
Target B ≤	7.30%	7.30%	7.20%
Target C ≤	3.50%	3.50%	3.40%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Multiple discussions took place during 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	84,546	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	62,192	null

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	5,405	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	1,542	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	247	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	200	null

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62,192	84,546	73.62%	71.50%	73.56%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,405	84,546	6.68%	7.30%	6.39%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,989	84,546	2.37%	3.50%	2.35%

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 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
A	Target ≥	85.50%
	Data	84.48%
B	Target ≤	6.30%
	Data	5.21%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	85.75%	86.00%	86.25%
Target B ≤	6.30%	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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	13,485	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">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</a>	11,664	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	316	null

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	148	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	11,664	13,485	84.48%	85.75%	86.50%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	465	13,485	5.21%	6.30%	3.45%

☐

Use a different calculation methodology

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 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
A1	Target ≥	81.09%
	Data	80.85%
A2	Target ≥	67.76%
	Data	67.49%
B1	Target ≥	82.11%
	Data	80.06%
B2	Target ≥	69.34%
	Data	68.52%
C1	Target ≥	82.08%
	Data	74.89%
C2	Target ≥	72.12%
	Data	70.84%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	82.60%	84.00%	85.30%
Target A2 ≥	69.50%	71.20%	72.90%
Target B1 ≥	83.50%	84.90%	86.20%
Target B2 ≥	71.10%	72.80%	74.40%
Target C1 ≥	83.50%	84.90%	86.20%
Target C2 ≥	73.80%	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 Preschool Program/Results Matter team members.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4504.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	178.00	3.95%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	489.00	10.86%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	851.00	18.89%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1892.00	42.01%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1094.00	24.29%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2743.00	3410.00	80.85%	82.60%	80.44%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2986.00	4504.00	67.49%	69.50%	66.30%

### Reasons for A2 Slippage

Review of the past years' data demonstrates that just under half of Colorado's Administrative Units (AUs) experienced some degree of slippage on A2. However, further analysis reveals that six of the AUs reporting slippage are primarily responsible for the overall decline. We are in the process of requesting additional information from those specific AUs about local practices or policies that they believe have influenced their performance. Additionally, we have begun to develop cumulative data reports to analyze performance over time as well as to develop ranking and impact ratings to identify which AUs have the most room for growth and are in the most need of support. For example, an intensive professional learning project focused on building the capacity of AU systems to identify and respond to children's social and emotional development needs will be targeted to the AUs whose data demonstrates a need in this area.

Slippage may be due to:

- inter-rater reliability of TS GOLD ratings, particularly for new teachers
- the need for increased teaming across general and special educators with respect to data collection, TS GOLD ratings, goal planning, and instruction
- quality of inclusive practices for all students
- the need for additional focus on assessment, instruction, and intervention in the area of social emotional development, or other possible factors

To address these issues, we have continued to provide professional learning (along with our assessment vendors) related to the tie between assessment ratings and outcome scores. We have also developed online learning modules to support overall data quality practices and use of data to inform instruction and support. Further, we are in process of developing a self assessment tool for AUs to utilize in rating the quality of their data use practices. Lastly, we continue to work towards integrating our child outcomes data with our special education data in order to determine if other factors related to special education enrollment may further explain changes we have observed (e.g. numbers of children whose performance is lagging and their disability categories, for example).

### 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	197.00	4.37%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	464.00	10.30%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	785.00	17.43%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1964.00	43.61%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1094.00	24.29%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool	2749.00	3410.00	80.06%	83.50%	80.62%

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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)					
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)	3058.00	4504.00	68.52%	71.10%	67.90%

### Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	173.00	3.84%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	263.00	5.84%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	271.00	6.02%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1292.00	28.69%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2505.00	55.62%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	1563.00	1999.00	74.89%	83.50%	78.19%
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)	3797.00	4504.00	70.84%	73.80%	84.30%

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.”

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

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none



FFY 2016 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
Target ≥	54.00%
Data	65.29%

Key: 

Gray – Data Prior to Baseline

Yellow – Baseline

Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	56.00%	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 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
831.00	1258.00	65.29%	56.00%	66.06%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	19.74%	6374.00
---	--------	---------

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

## FFY 2016 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.

The random sampling included 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.

### 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.

We sampled a total of 6384 parents of children with disabilities and received a total number of 1265 responses (19.8%). Out of the 1265 parents, 7 did not answer a sufficient number of questions (13 out of 16 questions), thus, were excluded from the analysis.

Analyses of the respondent population showed that it was a fair representation of Colorado's special education population according to disability. Each disability category was proportionately represented in the respondent population except for Speech Language Impairment and Specific Learning Disability, which were discrepant only by a few percentage points. More specifically, SLI was over-represented in the respondent population by 2.3% ( $z = -1.98, p = .05$ ) and SLD was under-represented by 6.1% ( $z = 4.54, p < .01$ ).

This trend may have stemmed from the fact that parents of younger children (Pre-K and K) whose eligibility for services were more likely to be SLI than students in older grades, were more eager to participate in the survey (Pre-K:  $z = -2.43, p = .01$ , K:  $z = -2.58, p < .01$ ). In contrast, parents of older students (11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>), whose eligibility for services were more likely to be SLD, may have been less eager to participate in the survey (11<sup>th</sup>:  $z = 2.41, p = .02$ , 12<sup>th</sup>:  $z = 9.25, p < .01$ ). As a result, responses from parents of students with SLI and parents of younger grades were over-represented in the survey, whereas responses from parents of students with SLD and parents of older grades were under-represented.

The racial category presentation in the respondent population showed some discrepancies from the special education population in Colorado. The greatest concern was under-representation of Hispanic ( $z = 5.77, p < .01$ ) and African American parents ( $z = 9.24, p < .01$ ). African American students accounted for 5.8% of Colorado's Special Ed Population in SY2016-17, however only 1.8% of the respondents were from African American parents. Conversely, responses from White parents were over-represented ( $z = -8.79, p < .01$ ). In addition, Native American parents were under-represented among the survey respondents ( $z = 3.12, p < .01$ ).

After observing the racial representation, we further examined the data and identified that the Native American under-representation was caused primarily by one AU, which accounts for a large portion of Native American special education enrollment in the state. For the survey which we are currently conducting for FFY 2017 reporting, we are working closely with this AU to improve the response rate from Native American parents.

Further analysis gave us insight that the under-representation of African American and Hispanic parents is a state-wide issue; there were no particular AUs that were concentrated with African American population and did not achieve sufficient response rates. We had a discussion with local special education directors and agreed that, for FFY 2017 survey, when AUs encounter a student who was randomly selected for the parent survey but no longer enrolled, they would replace this student with an African American or Hispanic student who is still enrolled in the AU. We hope that such practice will yield a more racially proportionate representation in the FFY 2017 survey.

Each gender was represented proportionately among the survey respondents.

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 a single AU being the stratum. Then, a random sampling was drawn from each AU. This method makes it possible to reduce sample size required to achieve randomness, 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

Submitted survey: [ParentSurveyQuestions 2017-18](#)

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.

Improving response rates from Native American Parents: For the survey which we are currently conducting for FFY 2017 reporting, we have engaged with the Director of Special Education and, with the assistance of our Title VI coordinator, we are working closely with this AU to gain an appropriate number of responses from Native American parents.

Improving response rates from African American and Hispanic Parents: Since this is a state-wide issue we have engaged the local special education directors across the State. We agreed that, for FFY 2017 survey, when AUs encounter a student who was randomly selected for the parent survey but no longer enrolled, they would replace this student with an African American and/or Hispanic student who is still enrolled in the AU. We hope that such practice will yield a more racially proportionate representation in the FFY 2017 survey.

#### ☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Until FFY 2015, the department weighted some of the 16 questions used in the survey, and when the parents' response scale score exceeded 75% of total possible scale score, the parent was considered as believing that the school facilitated parent involvement. The weighting method was confusing for parents and hard to interpret. Removing the weighting was examined and an analysis was conducted to ensure that 1) it would be easier to understand, 2) it would be easier to interpret, and 3) it would not change the end results.

Upon the conclusion of the FFY 2016 parent survey, we conducted an analysis of both methods (the old calculation would have yielded 65.9% agreement, whereas 66% agreement was observed with the new calculation). Thus starting in FFY 2016, we no longer weighted the questions, thus, all questions were worth the same amount of points. Moreover, the parent was considered as believing that the school facilitated parent involvement when the parent responded to the 16 survey questions with an average likert scale of 4.0 or greater (a 5-point likert scale was used in the survey; 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*).

The slight change in our calculation methodology has made the interpretation of the survey results much easier to understand without changing the percentage of parents who reported schools facilitated parent involvement.

none

FFY 2016 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
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 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 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	61	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.

FFY 2016 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 2015 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 2015

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 2016 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
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 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 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.

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	60	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 2016 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 2015 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 2015

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 2016 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
Target	100%
Data	97.91%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
20,331	19,925	97.91%	100%	98.00%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	406
---	-----

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.

Among the 406 records with delayed evaluation of IEPs the number of days beyond 60 was calculated for 384 records where an evaluation was indeed completed.

11 of them were students aged 2.5 but not yet 4 years old who had received Part C services immediately prior to Part B evaluation, and 373 were students aged 2.5 to 21 years old who had not received Part C services immediately prior to Part B evaluation.

Among the 373 students, the minimum number of days between the 60<sup>th</sup> day from parental consent and evaluation was 1 day, maximum was 364 days, and median was 9 days.

Among the 11 students, the minimum number of days between the 60<sup>th</sup> day from parental consent and evaluation was 1 day, maximum was 117 days, and median was 12.5 days. These records did not have a valid reason to be delayed. The CDE is providing TA for the 4 AUs that had these 11 individual instances to ensure 100% compliance in the future.

### 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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 were tuitioned to an in-state or 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.

### Criteria:

There is one snapshot performed for Special Education End of Year.

1. Procedures for Special Education End of Year collection.

- Pull all error-free records from the Student Participation file (except those with a PAI code of 23, 24, 31, and 32 or Special Education Part C Referral code of 00) and match them with records in the Student Profile interchange (Student Demographic file and School Association file). The Student Profile Interchange is the authoritative source for (SASID, LASID, Student's First Name, Student's Middle Name, Student's Last Name, Gender, Date of Birth, All Student Contact Information fields (if required), Ethnicity, Race, and Grade level).
- If the student is not submitted to the Student Interchange, these fields will be pulled from the Special Education Child file.
- All additional fields will be pulled from the Special Education Student Participation file, except for federal race student and the ELL status, which are calculated.
- The Special Education Child, Participation, Student Parent Association and Student Demographics files will be joined based on the following criteria: SASID, LASID, school year, Admin Unit (or district), and error free records.
- Data pulled from the Student Profile Interchange will be the non-tagged data.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 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 2015

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 2016 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
Target	100%
Data	97.01%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,074
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	426
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,899
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.	589
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	99
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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)]x100	1,899	1,960	97.01%	100%	96.89%

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	61
--	----

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.

Among the 61 records with delayed implementation of IEPs, the minimum number of days between birthday and implementation was 2 days, maximum was 287 days, and median was 13 days. These records did not have a valid reason to be delayed. These records are spread out over 9 AUs and all have received TA. One AU had a slightly higher number than the rest and is receiving targeted technical assistance to ensure 100% compliance.

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.

Local early childhood systems have continued to refine their transition processes and procedures to achieve timely transitions, create plans with all  
3/16/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 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 2015**

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 2016 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
Target	100%
Data	93.45%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
176	176	93.45%	100%	100%

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.

The CDE conducted record reviews for Indicator 13 compliance by accessing IEPs uploaded by the Administrative Units (AUs) into 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 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In addition to providing storage for verified data submissions and the AUs' Comprehensive Plans, the system also provides tools for record reviews, fiscal self-audits, detailed displays of the results from parent surveys, and data analyses and reports. The system allows for timely and user-friendly development of AU-level results for each item of the NSTTAC Indicator 13 review checklist as well as a total score so that local agencies can readily utilize this information for future local level planning activities.

Transition IEP samples were pulled using the following methodology:

- The samples pulled for the reviews came from the 2015 December Count Data.
- AUs received 3% of ALL IEPs with a minimum of 10, maximum of 50.
- The CDE selected 20% of the 3% of all IEPs for the Transition IEP review with a minimum of 5 and maximum of 10 Transition IEPs

☒ Yes ☐ No

Actions required in FFY 2015 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 2015

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 2016 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
A	Target ≥	32.50%
	Data	25.63%
B	Target ≥	61.00%
	Data	60.44%
C	Target ≥	69.00%
	Data	77.48%

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.75%	32.75%	33.00%
Target B ≥	61.25%	61.25%	61.50%
Target C ≥	69.25%	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 2016 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	2008.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	524.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	718.00
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)	144.00
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).	116.00

## FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	524.00	2008.00	25.63%	32.75%	26.10%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1242.00	2008.00	60.44%	61.25%	61.85%
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)	1502.00	2008.00	77.48%	69.25%	74.80%

### 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.

Colorado uses a combination of population and stratified sampling for indicator 14 data collection. AUs with 100 or fewer youth who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school were tasked to interview all exiters. Six AUs with more than 100 but 200 or fewer special ed exiters received a list of 100 randomly selected former students to interview. Finally, 7 AUs with more than 200 special ed exiters received a list of 200 randomly selected former students to interview. As a result, out of the 5,134 special ed exiters Colorado had in SY2015-16, 3,651 were selected for the indicator 14 interview. Because 63 of them returned to high school or passed away, the final interview size was reduced to 3,588 students. Out of the 3,588 former students with IEPs, 2,008 of them participated in the indicator 14 interview (56%).

The limited use of stratified sampling ensures that our interview population makes an appropriate estimate of former students with IEPs. A stratified sampling was used only for larger 13 AUs at a varying degree (i.e., 100 random sample for AUs with exiting population of 100-200, 200 random sample for AUs with exiting population of 200-300). This method makes it possible to reduce sample size required to achieve randomness, making the proportionate representation in the sample more likely. It also ensures that the department hears from former students with IEPs of each AU.

### 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.

Analyses of the respondents' demographics showed that it was a fair representation of Colorado's former students with IEPs overall. All disability categories of the former students with IEPs were proportionately represented among the interview respondents. The same can be concluded about gender.

Race, however, had some discrepancies between the population and the respondents; White race was over-represented by 6% ( $z = -4.59, p < .01$ ) which seemed to be driven by the under-representation of Black and Hispanic under-representation (-3% each;  $z = 3.90, p < .01$  for Black,  $z = 2.50, p = .01$  for Hispanic). We also found that students who exited schools by graduating with regular diploma were over-represented in the interview participants by 7% ( $z = -6.98, p < .01$ ) which seemed to be driven by the under-representation of former students who exited schools by dropping out (-7%,  $z = 8.02, p < .01$ ).

Racial categories in the sample did not represent the population adequately overall, due to the under representation of African American students and Hispanic students and over representation of White students. Similarly, dropout status did not represent the population adequately due to the under representation of students who dropped out in the sample.

Further analysis of the data indicated that several districts in the Denver metro region tended to have a larger population of former students who are Hispanic or African American with IEPs as well as a larger percentage of students who exited high school by dropping out. Moreover, these districts struggled with reaching out to their former students for the purpose of completing the Post-School Outcome (PSO) interview.

Prior to our SY2018-19 PSO data collection, we plan to host a meeting in which these districts are invited to discuss strategies to reach out to a greater number of their students who are Hispanic or African American, and students who dropped out. In addition, we will invite 2 districts from the Denver Metro region that have been successful in reaching out to their Hispanic and African-American population and drop-outs respectively, so that they can discuss barriers and share the strategies they employ.

Additionally, we found that an extremely low participation rate of one large district in the Denver metro region to be especially impactful to the state's under-representation of students who are Hispanic or African-American, and students who dropped out. We will provide targeted TA for this district prior to and during the SY2018-19 PSO data collection.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none



# FFY 2016 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
Target ≥	50.00%
Data	50.00%

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	51.00%	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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	5	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	8	null

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5	8	50.00%	51.00%	62.50%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

# FFY 2016 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
Target ≥	61.00%
Data	72.73%

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

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	62.00%	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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	11	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	8	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	29	null

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
11	8	29	72.73%	62.00%	65.52%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 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
Target ≥				19.00%
Data				

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	18.50%	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 2016 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 2016 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: Wendy Sawtell

Title: SPP/APR Coordinator

Email: sawtell\_w@cde.state.co

Phone: 303-866-6749