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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

In SY2020-21, Colorado was comprised of 68 Administrative Units (AUs), which served as Educational Service Agencies. The size of these AUs range from a single school district to AUs that consist of more than 10 individual school districts. In Colorado, the AUs are considered the Local Educational Agency (LEA) for the purpose of administering the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and are responsible for the provision of a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) to students with disabilities.  
  
The table below summarizes whether Colorado met the FFY2020 performance target for each indicator and if a slippage was detected.  
  
Indicator ………… Target Met? ………… Slippage?  
1 ……………………... NA ……………………… NA  
2 ……………………... Yes …………………...… No  
3A 4th ELA …….......… No ……………………… NA  
3A 4th Math……..….… No ……………………… NA  
3A 8th ELA …….......… No ……………………… NA  
3A 8th Math……..….… No ……………………… NA  
3A HS ELA ………..… No ……………………… NA  
3A HS Math………..… No ……………………… NA  
3B 4th ELA ………...… No ……………………… NA  
3B 4th Math……..….… No ……………………… NA  
3B 8th ELA …..…….… No ……………………… NA  
3B 8th Math..……….… No ……………………… NA  
3B HS ELA ….…….… NA ……………………… NA  
3B HS Math….…….… NA ……………………… NA  
3C 4th ELA ….…….… Yes ……………………… NA  
3C 4th Math….……..…Yes ……………………… NA  
3C 8th ELA …...…….… No ……………………… NA  
3C 8th Math..…….….… No ……………………… NA  
3C HS ELA ….……..… No ……………………… NA  
3C HS Math….…....… Yes ……………………… NA  
3D 4th ELA …….......… Yes ……………………… NA  
3D 4th Math……..….… Yes ……………………… NA  
3D 8th ELA …..…….… Yes ……………………… NA  
3D 8th Math..……….… Yes ……………………… NA  
3D HS ELA ….……..… NA ……………………… NA  
3D HS Math….……..… NA ……………………… NA  
4A ………….………… Yes ……………………… No  
4B ………….………… Yes ……………………… No  
5A.. …………………… NA ……….……………… NA  
5B.. …………………… NA ……….……………… NA  
5C...…………………… NA ……….……………… NA  
6A …………………….. NA …….………………… NA  
6B …………………….. NA …….………………… NA  
6C …………………….. NA …….………………… NA  
7A1 …………………… No …………………….… No  
7A2 …………………… No ………………….…… No   
7B1 …………………… No ………………….…… No  
7B2 …………………… No ………………….…… No  
7C1 ………………….. Yes ………………….…… No  
7C2 …………………… No …………………….… No  
8 …………………….… NA ……………………… NA  
9 ……………………… Yes ……………………… No  
10 ……………..……… Yes ……………………… No  
11 ……………………… No ……………………… No  
12 ……………………… No ……………………… No  
13 ……………………… No ……………………… Yes  
14A …………….……… No ……………………… Yes  
14B …………….……… No ……………………… No  
14C ……….…………… No ……………………… Yes  
15 ……………………… NA ……………………… NA  
16 ……………………… No ……………………… Yes  
  
In addition to setting the targets for Indicators 1 through 17 that cover the years of the SPP, the baseline year/data of the following indicators have been revised:  
Indicator 1   
Indicator 3 A, B, C, and D  
Indicator 5  
Indicator 6  
Indicator 8  
Indicator 16

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

Per Colorado's 2021 federal assessment waiver, the state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021. Student participation among the grades with voluntary participation was low (less than 10%), and participants were not representative of the overall demographics or performance of the state. Even for the grades required to be tested, participation varied widely within and across districts and student groups. Given the overall low and wide variance in participation, data from this assessment should not be used for historical comparison purposes across districts, schools, student groups and/or years. For more information about the 2021 state assessment administration and the waiver, please see: http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/factsheetsandfaqs-assessment.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

68

**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 Colorado Department of Education (CDE) provides support and accountability to Administrative Units (AUs) to meet the needs of IDEA eligible students in Colorado. Data are gathered on an annual basis from all AUs to ensure compliance and to monitor student outcomes.  
  
Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:  
  
Colorado General Supervision and Monitoring 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 and IDEA/ECEA regulatory requirements.  
2. 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.  
  
As part of its overall monitoring process, CDE’s Office of Special Education (OSE) gathers and analyzes the data described below and may provide additional verification and improvement activities through facilitated self-assessment, IEP file reviews, and other technical assistance activities.  
Student Data Include:   
• Prevalence rate by disability, race, and ethnic categories  
• Percentage of time with students without disabilities  
• Educational placement of students with disabilities  
• Evaluation timelines  
• IEP implementation timelines   
• Performance on state assessments  
• Preschool outcomes  
• Graduation and dropout rates  
• Extra-curricular opportunities and integration with peers without disabilities and educational settings for preschool students with disabilities  
• Students exiting special education  
• Data regarding disciplinary exclusions, including disaggregation by disability, race, and ethnic categories  
• Transition IEP compliance  
• Post School Outcomes  
  
The OSE uses information and multiple data sources to verify the information described above.   
The data noted above are used to evaluate the performance of AUs on the State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators and their related requirements. In partnership with AUs, these data are examined 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)  
• Areas of non-compliance  
• Inadequate student performance  
  
OSE staff also monitor and track licenses and qualified status of special education providers to ensure compliance. Date collected in this area are related to:   
• Personnel Qualifications  
• Staff caseload information  
  
OSE staff also works closely with CDE’s School Finance Unit to ensure that each AU meets requirements specific to excess cost calculation, maintenance of effort, and allowable use of funds. As part of this effort CDE considers the following:  
• IDEA Part B and Preschool Narratives and Budgets  
• End of Year fiscal reporting  
  
Data from dispute resolution is also included as part of the OSE’s overall process. Data and information include:  
• Dispute resolution findings of noncompliance, including state complaints and due process hearings  
• Areas of concern identified outside the scope of an investigation, including concerns raised by parents in calls with dispute resolution staff  
  
The OSE analyzes the data to identify trends on a state and AU level that may indicate systemic noncompliance with state and federal regulations and to inform general supervision activities.  
  
Verification of Correction and Enforcement Activities:  
  
The OSE’s General Supervision and Monitoring Staff work collaboratively with the state’s local special education directors to identify root causes that resulted in non-compliance and/or to provide technical assistance to support AUs in correcting non-compliance and sustaining compliance. In all instances of student-specific non-compliance, immediate correction is required.  
  
A Description of CDE’s Dispute Resolution Process  
  
  
Facilitated IEP Process:  
  
The CDE supports IEP facilitation as a practice for preventing and intervening constructively in disagreements that may emerge during the IEP meeting. CDE currently offers statewide facilitators to support districts and parents at no cost. CDE also provides facilitation training to build sustainability.  
  
Mediation:  
  
Mediation is available at no cost to parents and school districts who have disputes involving any matter under Part B.   
When CDE receives a request for mediation, dispute resolution staff confirm that both parties are agreeable to mediation. Once both parties have agreed to mediation, a mediator is assigned based on a random or rotational basis.   
  
State Complaints Process:  
  
The state complaint process is available to any party who believes a public agency has violated IDEA/ECEA. When a state complaint is filed, a state complaint officer (SCO) notifies the parties whether the complaint is accepted for investigation. If a complaint is rejected for not meeting content requirements, the party is informed of the reasons why and notified of their right to refile.  
The SCO uses a variety of investigative techniques including requests for information, interviews, and review of records. Within 60 days, the SCO issues a decision that includes findings of fact and conclusions of law, unless properly extended for mediation or exceptional circumstances.   
If the investigation results in findings of noncompliance, the SCO orders corrective action and establishes dates for completion of activities, as well as documentation that must be submitted to demonstrate that corrective action has been taken.   
  
Due Process Hearings:  
  
CDE uses Administrative Law Judges (ALJ) to provide due process hearings. The OSE tracks applicable timelines to ensure compliance with IDEA and provides a copy of the decision for publication and dissemination to the state special education advisory committee. The OSE regularly provides training in special education law to ALJs. If the ALJ orders remedies, the General Supervision Team is notified to ensure compliance.

**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.**

OSE consultants are available via email, telephone, and in person to address AU-specific requests for technical assistance (TA) as a part of the General Supervision System. In addition, the CDE provides varied levels of technical assistance based on need.   
  
Universal Support   
Available for AUs that demonstrate compliance with IDEA and Colorado’s Exceptional Children’s Education Act (ECEA) regulations based on performance indicators and data sources (described in more detail above). Examples of Universal Supports may include resources on the website, self-assessment tool, conferences, and webinars.   
  
Targeted Support   
Available for AUs that demonstrate multiple areas of moderate need over 12-18 months as reflected in performance indicators, student achievement data, and other data sources (described above). The AU’s specific area(s) of need are targeted through TA activities and interventions identified through a facilitated self-assessment tool and developed with the AU. Examples of Targeted Supports include but are not limited to side-by-side assistance, in-person professional learning, and tools and resources to analyze areas of concern.  
  
Intensive Support   
Available for AUs that demonstrate ongoing areas of intense need or many areas of need that have not been adequately addressed, as reflected in performance indicators, student achievement data and other data sources described above. A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is developed to address findings of noncompliance. The AU receives intensive support from the CDE (e.g., site visits, professional development, increased data reporting to the CDE in targeted area(s), virtual meetings, desk audit) to develop and implement the CAP. The CDE follows up with AUs regarding its CAP on a regular basis to ensure compliance and progress.

**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 children with disabilities.**

Colorado has key systems in place to ensure that educators and related service providers have the knowledge and skills to work effectively with all students with disabilities. This includes support and monitoring of content provided by special education personnel preparation programs and providing statewide universal, targeted, and intensive technical assistance to Colorado school personnel working with students with disabilities.  
   
Institutions of higher education in the state work closely with the CDE and the Department of Higher Education to assure programs that cover the range of knowledge and skills required of teachers of students with disabilities, across all age ranges and eligibility categories. Fourteen public and/or private four-year schools in Colorado offer undergraduate and/or graduate degrees and licensure programs in special education. There are currently five BOCES approved by the CDE to offer alternate programs leading to licensure as a special education generalist.  
  
The CDE is responsible for the content review of all teacher preparation programs, both traditional and alternative, 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 and private institutions. The OSE works closely with CDE's Educator Talent Licensing Office to review the content of any program that seeks to prepare teachers in special education and related fields. This also includes a review of general and special education content specific to reading instruction. The 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.  
  
The OSE is actively engaged in the enhancement of skills and knowledge required of licensed special education personnel currently working in the field. The OSE provides professional development in areas identified by parents, teachers, related service providers, local Directors of Special Education, and OSE consultants. Data that inform training and coaching topics are determined from state performance results and need assessments. Technical assistance topics are further informed by national and state initiatives that support the efficacy of inclusion and instruction for learners with disabilities. Discipline-specific specialists in the OSE work with the field to confirm and prioritize training topics. The CDE archives universal-level professional learning for providers to access at any time. This allows for base-training across a variety of topics to build core capacity. Deeper content professional development is offered through a calendar of virtual and in-person opportunities across respective disciplines. A new feature during the pandemic are routine office-hours by discipline-specific consultants that offer real-time training and discussion opportunities on topics pertinent across providers. As needed, AUs can engage in highly customized training to address needs stemming from their unique training targets, including corrective action training supports.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The following mechanisms were used to gather broad stakeholder feedback:  
CDE Stakeholders  
• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
Public Stakeholders  
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public. Specifically, the survey included feedback on related to the following:  
• Appropriateness of the indicator targets (e.g., too high, too low, or appropriate).  
• Are the proposed improvement strategies reasonably calculated to allow the state to reach the proposed targets?  
• Is the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection?  
• What school district is respondent a part of?  
• Role of the respondent (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member). Respondents were allowed to select multiple roles.  
• Respondents were asked to provide contact information (e.g., email address)  
• Develop a web page to include:  
• Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
• A series of webinars explaining each of the indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
• A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period. Specifically, the survey included feedback on related to the following:  
? Appropriateness of the indicator targets (e.g., too high, too low, or appropriate).  
? Are the proposed improvement strategies reasonably calculated to allow the state to reach the proposed targets?  
? Is the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection?  
? What school district is respondent a part of?  
? Role of the respondent (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member). Respondents were allowed to select multiple roles.  
? Respondents were asked to provide contact information (e.g., email address)  
  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils (e.g., Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee).  
• Incorporate all feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director/State Director of Special Education  
• Present proposed targets to state advisory groups: (e.g., Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee) and parent advocacy groups (e.g., The ARC of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, and Disability Law Colorado).   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the 2021 Fall Directors’ Meeting and gather input through the indicator surveys.  
• Provide a two month public comment period to solicit public comments through a broad communication plan which includes a dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, announcements and links through CDE’s Facebook page and Twitter Account, a CDE webpage news story, information and links in CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, and notifications to our parent advocacy agencies.  
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

NO

**Number of Parent Members:**

45

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Small group virtual presentations were held with parent members from each of these groups: the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC), PEAK, The ARC of Colorado, Disability Law Colorado, Parent Partnerships for Equity, and the Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC). During these meetings, participants were encouraged to ask questions about the history and performance on each indicator and to complete the surveys for the indicators. Follow-up emails, with the link to the dedicated webpage, were sent to each group when the public comment period opened, so that they can share with their constituents.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

Small group virtual presentations were held with parent members from each of these groups: CSEAC, PEAK, The Arc of Colorado, Disability Law Colorado, Parent Partnerships for Equity, and PSSEAC. During these meetings, participants were encouraged to ask questions about the history and performance on each indicator and to complete the surveys for the indicators. Follow-up emails, with the link to the dedicated webpage, were sent to each group when the public comment period opened, so that they can share with their constituents.  
For the public comment period, to increase capacity of diverse group of parents who might not be familiar with the SPP-APR, we created a series of webinars explaining each of the indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies. These webinars were posted along with the link to an indicator input survey, so that parents can educate themselves on the contents before providing feedback to each indicator.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Nov. 8, 2021- January 7, 2022 - Solicited public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan including a dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, and additional notifications to our parent advocacy agencies.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

By June 2022, the CDE will publish the final results of the FFY2020 SPP/APR on it’s website. The CDE will send a separate notification to each of the stakeholder groups that participated in virtual meetings during the course of the process.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

Following the submission of the FFY2019 SPP/APR to the U.S. Department of Education, the CDE posted the FFY2019 performance of each AU on the following website:   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/AUperformanceprofiles.asp   
A complete and final copy of the State’s SPP/APR was also posted on the following website:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/spp-apr

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

In response to the States' Determination of Needs Assistance, Colorado has accessed the following technical assistance.  
  
Results Driven Accountability  
TA sources  
• National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)  
• IDEA Data Center   
• Office of Special Education Programs  
  
Colorado’s Action   
• NSCI provided samples of states’ monitoring self-assessments and the educational benefit reviews. Based on these, the Colorado General Supervision and Monitoring Team evaluated processes and components of states’ systems. A comprehensive comparison of models was developed and presented to Colorado leadership. A proposed framework was developed and the implementation of the work of developing a new Colorado monitoring and supervision Facilitated Self-Assessment (FSA) including Education Benefit Review (EBR) was begun in July, 2020 with internal stakeholders and continued through 2021. Colorado plans to pilot the EBR and portions of an FSA in the 2022-2023 school year.   
• With the support from the IDEA Data Center regarding significant disproportionality (e.g., peer-to-peer exchange, significant disproportionality summit), Colorado kept refining its significant disproportionality monitoring system. We now have a more hands-on support for the root-cause analysis and the CCEIS action plan development as well as a robust approval process for the CCEIS action plan submissions.  
•IDEA Data Center meetings provided information and models used to design Colorado’s stakeholder input process in preparation for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission.   
  
  
Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 (Graduation, Dropout, Transition Compliance, and Post School Outcomes)  
TA sources  
• National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT)  
  
Colorado’s Action   
• Support to setup a framework to increase students with disabilities’ access to career technical education (CTE) programs   
• Developed a project that creates a partnership between CDE/ESSU, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and Colorado Community College System/CTE in Colorado to build a pipeline to career readiness success at the systemic level for students with disabilities engaged in CTE programming statewide with a focus on rural and underserved geographic areas of Colorado.  
• Assembled a core planning team  
• Developed an interest assessment for the field to determine interest in the project.   
• Provided an informational webinar to provide information to individuals who expressed interest in the project.   
• Set up meeting with NAPE discuss data dashboard and requirements for CDE.  
• The core planning team will be assembled to review CTE data, identify potential pilot sites based on data analysis and AU interest, and begin working on the project proposal.  
• Developed a proposal for submission to CDE leadership team.  
• Coordinated a professional development series on Micro messaging to Reach and Teach Every Student and Inspiring Courage to Excel through Self-Efficacy as a foundation for the Pipeline to Career Success project to be implement SY 2022-2023  
• Identified pilot sites, and working with NAPE to prepare for implementation of project SY 2022-2023  
• Support and coaching on the postschool outcomes interview process  
o Redesigned Post-school outcome (PSO) interview protocol  
o Used information to lead PSO stakeholder group discussions  
o Designed and delivered PSO interview training to the field  
o Designed website to include information provided by NTACT  
o Provided statewide training on increasing PSO participation rates  
o Held two peer-to-peer sharing meetings with AUs who did not meet participation rate state targets  
• Graduation rate support  
o Identified two AUs whose graduation rates significantly impacts the state  
o Met with leadership teams from each AU – meeting included representatives from NTACT-C, CDE Alternative Education Campus (AEC) and Dropout Prevention and Student Reengagement office discuss data develop a plan for support  
o CDE/ESSU, CDE AEC and Dropout Prevention, and NTACT-C are supporting AUs by assisting them to analyze disaggregated data, conduct and policy and practices reviews, and develop a plan to address challenges identified  
• Provided training and resources regarding COVID supports  
o Webinar to provide support and resources to address needs in the field  
o Offered office hours to discuss challenges  
o Developed webpage to provide resources to the field  
• Provided training and supports on postsecondary goals for students with significant support needs  
o Developed training webinar and resources to provide guidance on how to write postsecondary goals for students with significant support needs  
• Developed and provided training on each component of secondary transition IEPs  
• Developed and piloted transition quality indicators in three AUs  
• Piloted Transition Coalition IDEA and Secondary Transition self-study module  
• Assisted in the development and implementation of the Colorado Sequencing of Services model  
• Ongoing coaching and support for State Toolkit for Examining Post-School Success (STEPSS)  
o Continued to support school districts who were in the implementation phase of STEPSS  
  
Indicator 6 & 7: (Preschool Settings and Skills)  
TA sources  
• Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)  
• Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)  
  
Colorado’s Action   
• Through participation in the Child Outcomes Data Use Cohort, Colorado is able to work within the cohort with family and local administrative unit representatives to identify critical questions for Preschool Outcomes and promote data use in local communities.  
• Three critical questions were developed through the Child Outcomes Data Use Cohort to guide program improvement for TA  
• A process protocol for Data-Based Decision-Making is being developed in conjunction with the Child Outcomes Data Use Cohort for local AUs to consider using to drive program improvement.  
• Colorado worked with our primary assessment vendor to reset their automatic conversion algorithms for Indicator 7 reporting. Changes to the automatic conversion process will take effect in the 21-22 reporting year.  
  
Indicator 8: (Parent Involvement)  
TA sources  
• IDEA Data Center  
  
Colorado’s Action   
• With help from the IDEA Data Center, Colorado developed a new sampling method for the parent survey. The new sampling method will be used for SY2021-22.  
  
Indicator 15 & 16: (Dispute Resolution)  
TA sources  
• The CDE contracts with, and participates in, the TAESE Dispute Resolution quarterly workgroups for State Complaints Officers, Mediators and Due Process Hearing Officers. State Compliant Officers and SEA staff participate on the State Complaints call; SEA staff and contract mediators participate on the Mediators call; and SEA staff and Administrative Law Judges participate on the Due Process call.   
• Mediators and SEA staff attended in the CADRE Conference in October 2021.   
• The CDE held a virtual Special Education Legal Conference in April 2021 with both national and local speakers. This was attended by SEA staff, ALJs, Mediators, and State Complaints Officers.   
• State Complaints Officers attended the Tri-State Legal Conference and Complaint Investigator Pre-Conference in November 2021.   
  
Colorado’s Action   
• Case law reviews, professional resources, and topic discussions assist in conducting effective and legally sound state complaint investigations, mediations, and due process hearings  
• The Tri-State Pre-Conference for Complaint Investigators provides an opportunity for SCOs to discuss critical legal issues and potential solutions to complicated challenges with other investigators across the country. Specifically, the SCOs network and develop partnerships with investigators, receive updates from other states, better understand the complaint investigation process and develop a better understanding of legal issues pertaining to complaint investigation.  
• Additionally, the CDE will also be convening a dispute resolution advisory group to explore improvements to all three IDEA processes.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 79.27% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 80.00% | 73.40% | 75.00% | 76.60% | 78.20% |
| Data | 53.78% | 57.24% | 75.43% | 74.12% | 76.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 79.27% | 79.27% | 79.83% | 81.09% | 82.35% | 83.61% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 4,435 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 58 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 53 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 1,049 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4,435 | 5,595 | 76.50% | 79.27% | 79.27% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

Under Colorado law, “each school district board of education retains the authority to develop its own unique high school graduation requirements, so long as those local high school graduation requirements meet or exceed any minimum standards or basic core competencies or skills identified in the comprehensive set of guidelines for high school graduation developed by the state board pursuant to this paragraph.” 22-2-106(1)(a.5) C.R.S. There are no specific courses, or numbers of courses, required by the state’s graduation guidelines, and there are no legislated course requirements other than one course in Civics: “Satisfactory completion of a course on the civil government of the United States and the state of Colorado . . . shall be a condition of high school graduation in the public schools of this state.” 22-1-104 (3)(a) C.R.S.   
Youth with IEPs must meet the same requirements as youth without IEPs in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Colorado changed the baseline year to FFY2020. This is because Indicator 1’s data source has changed to EdFacts FS009, which impacted the comparability of the data before and after FFY2020.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 30.02% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 25.20% | 25.20% | 24.20% | 23.20% | 23.20% |
| Data | 23.02% | 23.62% | 22.13% | 22.17% | 19.43% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 18.75% | 18.75% | 16.67% | 16.67% | 14.59% | 14.59% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 4,435 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 58 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 53 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 1,049 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,049 | 5,595 | 19.43% | 18.75% | 18.75% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2015 | 91.14% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2015 | 82.96% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2015 | 75.83% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2015 | 91.57% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2015 | 83.66% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2015 | 75.08% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 8,842 | 8,040 | 5,883 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 293 | 200 | 393 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 319 | 249 | 2,893 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 136 | 125 | 299 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 8,809 | 8,001 | 5,887 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 3,115 | 1,837 | 393 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 2,610 | 2,130 | 2,893 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 329 | 354 | 301 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 748 | 8,842 |  | 95.00% | 8.46% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 574 | 8,040 |  | 95.00% | 7.14% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 3,585 | 5,883 |  | 95.00% | 60.94% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6,054 | 8,809 |  | 95.00% | 68.73% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 4,321 | 8,001 |  | 95.00% | 54.01% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 3,587 | 5,887 |  | 95.00% | 60.93% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Reporting of the Colorado Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults  
   
Performance results for Colorado’s Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on alternate standards can be found on the CDE’s website at:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltelam  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltsss   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped\_data under “Participation and Achievement in the State Assessments”  
  
Additional district or individual school information can be found at   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The revised baseline of FFY 2015 was used because Colorado changed its state assessment for 11th grade to the PSAT in this reporting year. Per Colorado's 2021 federal assessment waiver, the state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021. Student participation among the grades with voluntary participation was extremely low (less than 10%), and participants were not representative of the overall demographics or performance of the state. Even for the grades required to be tested, participation varied widely within and across districts and student groups. Given the overall low and wide variance in participation, data from this assessment should not be used for all historical comparative purposes across districts, schools, student groups and/or years. For more information about the 2021 state assessment administration and the waiver, please see http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/factsheetsandfaqs-assessment

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.  
  
Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, the State administered its general and alternate mathematics assessments to all students in grades 4, 6, and 8, and its general and alternate reading/language arts assessments to all students in grades 3, 5, and 7. In the other grades, assessment participation was voluntary. The State also administered its high school reading/language arts and mathematics assessment, the SAT, to all students.

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | FFY2018 | 10.39% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | FFY2018 | 7.20% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | FFY2020 | 17.10% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | FFY2018 | 8.34% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | FFY2018 | 5.36% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | FFY2020 | 5.90% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 10.39% | 11.64% | 12.90% | 14.15% | 15.41% | 16.67% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 7.20% | 7.99% | 8.78% | 9.56% | 10.35% | 11.14% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 17.10% | 17.42% | 17.74% | 18.06% | 18.38% | 18.70% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 8.34% | 9.25% | 10.20% | 10.87% | 11.54% | 12.23% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 5.36% | 6.84% | 8.31% | 9.77% | 11.23% | 12.70% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 5.90% | 6.10% | 6.30% | 3.50% | 6.70% | 6.90% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR  
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 612 | 449 | 3,286 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 43 | 19 | 79 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 19 | 13 | 482 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,725 | 3,967 | 3,286 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 375 | 78 | 35 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 95 | 56 | 160 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 62 | 612 |  | 10.39% | 10.13% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 32 | 449 |  | 7.20% | 7.13% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 561 | 3,286 |  | 17.10% | 17.07% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 470 | 5,725 |  | 8.34% | 8.21% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 134 | 3,967 |  | 5.36% | 3.38% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 195 | 3,286 |  | 5.90% | 5.93% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Reporting of the Colorado Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults  
   
Performance results for Colorado’s Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on alternate standards can be found on the CDE’s website at:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltelam  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltsss   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped\_data under “Participation and Achievement in the State Assessments”  
  
Additional district or individual school information can be found at   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

1. The revised baseline of FFY 2018 was used because FFY 2018 is the most recent year in which the Colorado state assessment was administered to all grade levels. In the 2 subsequent reporting years, Colorado suspended all state assessments and then assessed only certain grades in certain skills based on Colorado’s 2021 federal assessment waiver. The state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021.  
2. Resubmit targets showing improvement over baseline. The targets in the original submission were developed with stakeholder input and show improvement over baseline. No changes were made to the targets.   
Per Colorado's 2021 federal assessment waiver, the state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021. Student participation among the grades with voluntary participation was extremely low (less than 10%), and participants were not representative of the overall demographics or performance of the state. Even for the grades required to be tested, participation varied widely within and across districts and student groups. Given the overall low and wide variance in participation, data from this assessment should not be used for all historical comparative purposes across districts, schools, student groups and/or years. For more information about the 2021 state assessment administration and the waiver, please see http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/factsheetsandfaqs-assessment

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for Grade 4 Reading and Grade 8 Reading, and Grade 4 Math and Grade 8 Math, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts those revisions.  
  
The State has revised the baseline for HS Reading and HS Math, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept those revisions because there is no explanation for those revisions. In addition, the FFY 2020 baseline in the Historical Data Table does not match the FFY 2020 data reported in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data Table for HS Reading and HS Math.   
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for Grade 4 Reading and Grade 4 Math, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for HS Reading and HS Math, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because OSEP cannot determine whether the State’s end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State’s baseline data for those subindicators, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.  
  
Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, the State administered its general and alternate mathematics assessments to all students in grades 4, 6, and 8, and its general and alternate reading/language arts assessments to all students in grades 3, 5, and 7. In the other grades, assessment participation was voluntary. The State also administered its high school reading/language arts and mathematics assessment, the SAT, to all students.

## 3B - Required Actions

If the State chooses to revise the baseline for the sub indicators HS Reading and HS Math, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must provide an explanation for the revisions.  
  
The State did not provide targets for sub indicators Reading Group C and Math Group C, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | FFY2015 | 27.94% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | FFY2015 | 39.15% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | FFY2015 | 29.91% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | FFY2015 | 22.62% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | FFY2015 | 16.40% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | FFY2015 | 8.01% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 17.91% | 19.92% | 21.93% | 23.93% | 25.94% | 27.95% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 38.88% | 39.05% | 39.23% | 39.40% | 39.58% | 39.75% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 34.97% | 35.99% | 37.01% | 38.02% | 39.04% | 40.06% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 25.93% | 26.81% | 27.69% | 28.58% | 29.46% | 30.34% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.68% | 10.23% | 11.77% | 13.32% | 14.86% | 16.41% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 5.13% | 5.71% | 6.29% | 6.86% | 7.44% | 8.02% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR  
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 136 | 125 | 299 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 33 | 40 | 102 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 329 | 354 | 301 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 137 | 18 | 91 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 33 | 136 |  | 17.91% | 24.26% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 40 | 125 |  | 38.88% | 32.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 102 | 299 |  | 34.97% | 34.11% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 137 | 329 |  | 25.93% | 41.64% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 18 | 354 |  | 8.68% | 5.08% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 91 | 301 |  | 5.13% | 30.23% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Reporting of the Colorado Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-dataandresults  
   
Performance results for Colorado’s Alternate Assessment (CoAlt), based on alternate standards can be found on the CDE’s website at:  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltelam  
http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/newassess-coaltsss   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/sped\_data under “Participation and Achievement in the State Assessments”  
  
Additional district or individual school information can be found at   
http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

1. The revised baseline of FFY 2015 was used because Colorado changed its state assessment for 11th grade to the PSAT in this reporting year.   
2. Resubmit targets showing improvement over baseline. The targets in the original submission were developed with stakeholder input and show improvement over baseline. No changes were made to the targets.  
Per Colorado's 2021 federal assessment waiver, the state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021. Student participation among the grades with voluntary participation was extremely low (less than 10%), and participants were not representative of the overall demographics or performance of the state. Even for the grades required to be tested, participation varied widely within and across districts and student groups. Given the overall low and wide variance in participation, data from this assessment should not be used for all historical comparative purposes across districts, schools, student groups and/or years. For more information about the 2021 state assessment administration and the waiver, please see http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/factsheetsandfaqs-assessment

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.  
  
Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, the State administered its general and alternate mathematics assessments to all students in grades 4, 6, and 8, and its general and alternate reading/language arts assessments to all students in grades 3, 5, and 7. In the other grades, assessment participation was voluntary. The State also administered its high school reading/language arts and mathematics assessment, the SAT, to all students.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 37.11 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 39.74 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 42.88 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 25.27 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 31.52 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 30.42 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 37.11 | 37.11 | 37.11 | 37.11 | 37.11 | 37.10 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 39.74 | 39.74 | 39.74 | 39.74 | 39.74 | 39.73 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 42.88 | 42.60 | 42.30 | 41.90 | 41.60 | 41.30 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 25.27 | 25.27 | 25.27 | 25.27 | 25.27 | 25.26 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 31.52 | 31.52 | 31.52 | 31.52 | 31.52 | 31.51 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 30.42 | 30.30 | 30.10 | 29.90 | 29.70 | 29.50 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR  
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,774 | 4,459 | 51,140 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 612 | 449 | 3,286 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,584 | 1,969 | 28,552 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 56 | 37 | 2,110 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 43 | 19 | 79 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 19 | 13 | 482 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 46,740 | 39,178 | 51,140 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,725 | 3,967 | 3,286 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 13,041 | 11,341 | 17,500 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 286 | 227 | 1,090 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 375 | 78 | 35 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 95 | 56 | 160 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 10.13% | 45.72% |  | 37.11 | 35.59 | Met target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 7.13% | 44.99% |  | 39.74 | 37.86 | Met target | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 17.07% | 59.96% |  | 42.88 | 42.88 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 8.21% | 28.51% |  | 25.27 | 20.30 | Met target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 3.38% | 29.53% |  | 31.52 | 26.15 | Met target | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 5.93% | 36.35% |  | 30.42 | 30.42 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

1. The revised baseline of FFY 2018 was used because FFY 2018 is the most recent year in which the Colorado state assessment was administered to all grade levels. In the 2 subsequent reporting years, Colorado suspended all state assessments and then assessed only certain grades in certain skills based on Colorado’s 2021 federal assessment waiver. The state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021.  
2. Resubmit targets showing improvement over baseline. The targets in the original submission were developed with stakeholder input and show improvement over baseline. No changes were made to the targets.  
Per Colorado's 2021 federal assessment waiver, the state's Mathematics assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 3, 5, and 7, and the Reading/Language Arts assessment was provided on a voluntary basis in grades 4, 6, and 8 in spring 2021. Student participation among the grades with voluntary participation was extremely low (less than 10%), and participants were not representative of the overall demographics or performance of the state. Even for the grades required to be tested, participation varied widely within and across districts and student groups. Given the overall low and wide variance in participation, data from this assessment should not be used for all historical comparative purposes across districts, schools, student groups and/or years. For more information about the 2021 state assessment administration and the waiver, please see http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/factsheetsandfaqs-assessment

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for Grade 4 Reading, Grade 8 Reading, Grade 4 Math, and Grade 8 Math, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts those baselines.  
  
The State has established the baseline for HS Reading and HS Math, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept those baselines because there is no explanation regarding why the baseline year for HS Reading and HS Math is not consistent with the baseline years for Grade 4 Reading, Grade 8 Reading, Grade 4 Math, and Grade 8 Math.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for the sub indicators Grade 4 Reading, Grade 8 Reading, Grade 4 Math, and Grade 8 Math, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for HS Reading and HS Math, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because OSEP cannot determine whether the State’s end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State’s baseline data, given that the State's established baseline for HS Reading and HS Math cannot be accepted, as noted above.   
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.  
  
Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, the State administered its general and alternate mathematics assessments to all students in grades 4, 6, and 8, and its general and alternate reading/language arts assessments to all students in grades 3, 5, and 7. In the other grades, assessment participation was voluntary. The State also administered its high school reading/language arts and mathematics assessment, the SAT, to all students.

## 3D - Required Actions

The State must establish a baseline for HS Reading and HS Math, using data from FFY 2018, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. If the State chooses to establish baseline using a different federal fiscal year, the State must provide an explanation.   
  
The State did not provide targets the sub indicators HS Reading and HS Math, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 3.50% | 3.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 64 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.**

Colorado did not conduct the review of policies, procedures, and practices, because there was no AU identified as significantly discrepant.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

49

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 greater-than-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. The seven federal racial categories (i.e., White, Hispanic, Black, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, Asians, and Two or more Races) are examined.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.**

Colorado did not conduct the review of policies, procedures, and practices, because there was no AU identified as significantly discrepant.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 71.50% | 71.50% | 71.70% | 71.70% | 71.70% |
| A | 78.98% | Data | 73.62% | 73.56% | 74.69% | 75.46% | 76.82% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 7.30% | 7.30% | 7.30% | 7.20% | 7.20% |
| B | 5.03% | Data | 6.68% | 6.39% | 6.07% | 5.67% | 5.33% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.40% | 3.40% |
| C | 2.20% | Data | 2.37% | 2.35% | 2.32% | 2.42% | 2.30% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 78.98% | 77.69% | 78.02% | 78.34% | 78.67% | 78.99% |
| Target B <= | 5.03% | 5.28% | 5.21% | 5.15% | 5.09% | 5.02% |
| Target C <= | 2.20% | 2.22% | 2.22% | 2.21% | 2.20% | 2.19% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 98,705 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 77,959 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,965 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 1,836 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 87 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 249 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 77,959 | 98,705 | 76.82% | 78.98% | 78.98% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,965 | 98,705 | 5.33% | 5.03% | 5.03% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 2,172 | 98,705 | 2.30% | 2.20% | 2.20% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Colorado changed the baseline year to FFY2020. This is because the age range for Indicator 5 changed from 6-21 to 5-year-old kindergartener to 21, which impacted the comparability of the data before and after FFY2020.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 85.50% | 85.75% | 86.00% | 86.25% | 86.80% |
| **A** | Data | 84.48% | 86.50% | 87.36% | 86.79% | 87.41% |
| **B** | Target <= | 6.30% | 6.30% | 6.20% | 6.10% | 3.80% |
| **B** | Data | 5.21% | 3.45% | 3.91% | 3.77% | 3.19% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 91.92% |
| **B** | 2020 | 3.37% |
| **C** | 2020 | 0.23% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 91.92% | 91.92% | 91.92% | 91.92% | 91.92% | 92.00% |
| Target B <= | 3.37% | 3.37% | 3.37% | 3.37% | 3.37% | 3.30% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 0.23% | 0.23% | 0.23% | 0.23% | 0.23% | 0.22% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 2,598 | 4,509 | 1,075 | 8,182 |
| 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 | 2,389 | 4,151 | 981 | 7,521 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 70 | 64 | 19 | 153 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 32 | 72 | 19 | 123 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 8 | 10 | 1 | 19 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 7,521 | 8,182 | 87.41% | 91.92% | 91.92% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 276 | 8,182 | 3.19% | 3.37% | 3.37% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 19 | 8,182 |  | 0.23% | 0.23% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Colorado changed the baseline year to FFY2020. This is because the age range for Indicator 6 changed from 3-5 to “3-5 excluding 5-year-old kindergarteners,” which impacted the comparability of the data before and after FFY2020.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baselines for 6A and 6B and established the baseline for 6C for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts those baselines.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2017 | Target >= | 81.09% | 82.60% | 84.00% | 81.30% | 81.30% |
| A1 | 75.32% | Data | 80.85% | 80.44% | 75.32% | 76.16% | 71.83% |
| A2 | 2017 | Target >= | 67.76% | 69.50% | 71.20% | 67.76% | 67.77% |
| A2 | 63.25% | Data | 67.49% | 66.30% | 63.25% | 64.79% | 56.42% |
| B1 | 2017 | Target >= | 82.11% | 83.50% | 84.90% | 82.11% | 82.12% |
| B1 | 78.87% | Data | 80.06% | 80.62% | 78.87% | 79.16% | 73.37% |
| B2 | 2017 | Target >= | 69.34% | 71.10% | 72.80% | 69.34% | 69.35% |
| B2 | 66.95% | Data | 68.52% | 67.90% | 66.95% | 68.23% | 59.33% |
| C1 | 2017 | Target >= | 82.08% | 83.50% | 84.90% | 82.08% | 82.09% |
| C1 | 67.56% | Data | 74.89% | 78.19% | 67.56% | 75.87% | 71.90% |
| C2 | 2017 | Target >= | 72.12% | 73.80% | 75.40% | 72.12% | 72.13% |
| C2 | 58.51% | Data | 70.84% | 84.30% | 58.51% | 60.73% | 50.55% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 75.32% | 75.32% | 75.32% | 75.32% | 75.32% | 76.81% |
| Target A2 >= | 63.25% | 63.25% | 63.25% | 63.25% | 63.25% | 64.92% |
| Target B1 >= | 78.87% | 78.87% | 78.87% | 78.87% | 78.87% | 80.28% |
| Target B2 >= | 66.95% | 66.95% | 66.95% | 66.95% | 66.95% | 68.58% |
| Target C1 >= | 67.56% | 67.56% | 67.56% | 69.18% | 70.80% | 72.42% |
| Target C2 >= | 58.51% | 58.51% | 58.51% | 58.51% | 58.51% | 60.22% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

3,803

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 199 | 5.23% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 541 | 14.23% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 767 | 20.17% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,453 | 38.21% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 843 | 22.17% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,220 | 2,960 | 71.83% | 75.32% | 75.00% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 2,296 | 3,803 | 56.42% | 63.25% | 60.37% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 223 | 5.86% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 441 | 11.60% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 662 | 17.41% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,638 | 43.07% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 839 | 22.06% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,300 | 2,964 | 73.37% | 78.87% | 77.60% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 2,477 | 3,803 | 59.33% | 66.95% | 65.13% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 292 | 7.68% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 551 | 14.49% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 918 | 24.14% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,471 | 38.68% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 571 | 15.01% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,389 | 3,232 | 71.90% | 67.56% | 73.92% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 2,042 | 3,803 | 50.55% | 58.51% | 53.69% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

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

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

The online system pulls Outcomes data from the assessment checkpoints corresponding to the preschool IEP entry and exit dates to produce each progress category. The Center for IDEA Data Systems (DaSy), in collaboration with assessment publisher researchers and the Colorado Department of Education, have established cut points that are carefully calibrated to reflect children in each progress category.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

1. The baseline year was misreported in original submission. Baseline has been revised to FFY 2017 with stakeholder input because there was an algorithm change in the vendor system during this reporting period. The CDE preschool special education team consulted with the preschool special education advisory committee, which is comprised of preschool special educators, special education administrators, parents, representatives from higher education, and staff from the Office of Early Childhood from the Department of Human Services.  
Indicator 7, preschool outcomes, are determined by teacher and service providers’ rating of the child. Because the algorithm change in the vendor system happened in FFY 2017, the baseline was revised to FFY 2017. The reported targets for all sub-indicators are correct in the original submission and show improvement over the revised baseline.   
2. Resubmit targets showing improvement over baseline. The targets in the original submission were developed with stakeholder input and show improvement over baseline. No changes were made to the targets.  
The targets for FFY2017 are incorrectly shown in the table above.   
The correct targets are:  
A1 = 81.09%  
A2 = 67.76%  
B1 = 82.11%  
B2 = 69.34%  
C1 = 82.08%  
C2 = 72.12%

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 82.19% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 54.00% | 56.00% | 58.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| Data | 65.29% | 66.06% | 71.37% | 77.79% | 87.36% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 82.19% | 82.19% | 82.19% | 82.19% | 82.19% | 82.20% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 914 | | 1,112 | 87.36% | 82.19% | 82.19% | N/A | N/A |

**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.**

Colorado uses one type of survey for parents of all grade levels including parents of preschool children. Before the start of the survey, Colorado randomly samples parents of students whom we ask to participate in the survey. The pool of students includes 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. In fact, FFY 2020 survey respondents included 137 parents of preschool children, which corresponded to 12.3% of survey respondents. Since preschool students accounted for 10.1% of students with disabilities in Colorado, preschool parents’ voice was well-represented in the survey results.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

5,000

**Percentage of respondent parents**

22.24%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 20.97% | 22.24% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

• With the help from the IDEA Data Center, we investigated a new sampling method to improve diversity and increase response rate. We plan to employ the new sampling method in SY2022-23.   
• follow up individually with AUs with low response rates.  
• collaborate with the Special Ed Director Mentors to ensure that all new AU directors understand the importance of increasing parent survey response and using the data to improve outcomes for students.  
• engage our State Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) members to work with local Special Education Advisory Committees (SEACs) to “spread the word” about the parent survey.  
• collaborate with AU directors with outstanding parent survey response rate to share their strategies and how they use the collected data.  
• encourage AU directors to monitor the survey responses on the special education dashboard.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

As IDEA Data Center recommends, we investigated nonresponse bias by examining the responses that came in from parents at the end of the data collection period, as a proxy for nonresponders, compared to responses that came in during the beginning and middle of the data collection period. The IDEA data center notes that this method does not add additional costs to the data collection and provides insight into whether or not results may be biased. We divided the responses before/after May 1, 2021 to create the “beginning and middle” response group (accounted for 76.8% of the responses) and the “towards the end” response group (accounted for 23.2% of the responses). The responses to the survey questions did not differ for each group (Beginning/Middle: M =3.47, SD = 0.59, End: M =3.47, SD = 0.58); t (1096) = 0.001, p >.05. The 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 did not differ for parents who responded at the beginning/middle (81.73%) and towards the end (84.31%), X2 (1, N = 1098) = 0.34, p > .05. Given these results, nonresponse bias was not detected.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

Child’s race/ethnicity and attending AUs’ geographic region within the state were examined for their representativeness in the parent survey. The chart below summarizes the results of the representativeness analysis. When the difference between the demographic group’s representation in the special education population and representation among the survey respondents were greater than ±3%, the representativeness was considered inadequate.   
Neither race/ethnicity or geographic region were well-represented among the survey respondents. Hispanic/Latino parents and Black/African-American parents were underrepresented, while White parents were overrepresented among the survey respondents. In terms of geographic region, North Central, Northwest, and Pikes Peak regions were overrepresented among the survey respondents, but these overrepresentations seemed to have been driven by the severe underrepresentation of the Denver Metro region. Denver metro AUs have the highest enrollment of students with disabilities who are Black and Hispanic in the state. The poor participation rates of the Denver metro districts’ parents seemed to have exacerbated the poor representation of the region as well as of Black and Hispanic racial groups.  
  
Category ------------------------– Population Representation –-- Survey Respondents –-- ±Difference –-- Representative (<±3%)?  
  
Child’s Race/Ethnicity   
American Indian or Alaska Native …….........… 1.0% ………………. 0.6% ………..…... -0.34% …….……… Yes  
Asian …………………………………………..…. 1.8% ………………. 1.7% ………..…... -0.11% …….……… Yes  
Black or African American ………..……………. 5.3% ………………. 2.1%…….............. -3.27% …….……… No  
Hispanic or Latino …………………………….... 37.9% …….….…… 32.7% ....….....…... -5.12% ………..…… No  
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander......... 0.2% ………………. 0.3% ….….......….. 0.10% ……….…… Yes  
Two or More Races …………………………...… 4.5% ………………. 3.4% .……....….... -1.08% …….……… Yes  
White …………………………………………….. 49.3% …………..…. 59.2% ………...…... 9.82% ……….…… No  
  
Region  
Denver Metro …………………………………… 53.4% …………....... 30.2% .........……. -23.21% ……........… No  
North Central …………………………………… 14.0% ……….……... 24.7% ……………. 10.68% ……...……. No  
Northeast …………………….…………………… 2.2% ………………. 2.6% ..….......…….. 0.41% …….…..… Yes  
Northwest ………………………………………… 3.8% ….…………... 10.8% ……......……. 6.99% …….…...… No  
Pikes Peak …………………….………………… 16.9.………………... 21.8% …….....……. 4.83% …….……... No  
Southeast ………………………….……………… 1.6% ………………. 1.5% …………..…. -0.05% …….…..… Yes  
Southwest ………………………………………… 2.8% ……….………. 1.3% ………….…. -1.49% …….…..… Yes  
West Central …………………………….......…… 4.8% ……….………. 4.0% ……...…...… -0.80% ……...…… Yes  
Other (online, multi-site charter) …..……....…… 0.3% ….……………. 3.0% ….…..………. 2.65% …...……… Yes

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

• With the help from the IDEA Data Center, we investigated a new sampling method to improve diversity and increase response rate. We plan to employ the new sampling method in SY2022-23.   
• follow up individually with AUs with low response rates.  
• collaborate with the Special Ed Director Mentors to ensure that all new AU directors understand the importance of increasing parent survey response and using the data to improve outcomes for students.  
• engage our State Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) members to work with local Special Education Advisory Committees (SEACs) to “spread the word” about the parent survey.  
• collaborate with AU directors with outstanding parent survey response rate to share their strategies and how they use the collected data.  
• encourage AU directors to monitor the survey responses on the special education dashboard.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

A stratified sampling was used, with AU being the stratum. A random sample was drawn from each AU. AUs received a list of 50 to 200 randomly chosen students to survey their parents, depending on the size of the AU. This method makes it possible to reduce sample size required to achieve randomness, while making the proportionate representation in the sample more likely. It also ensures that the department hears from parents from each AU.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Colorado changed the baseline year to FFY2020 with stakeholder input. The survey questions changed in FFY2019 and the protocol changed in FFY2020, which impacted the comparability of the data before and after FFY2020. Sampling plan – Colorado made its best effort to locate our most recent approved sampling plan and were unable to find one. We will continue to collect data for this Indicator using sampling and will submit a new plan for OSEP approval at a later date.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

All of the required components have been addressed in the FFY2020 SPP/APR.

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, OSEP required the State to submit its sampling plan to and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan. The State did not provide its sampling plan but reported, "Colorado made its best effort to locate our most recent approved sampling plan and were unable to find one. We will continue to collect data for this Indicator using sampling and will submit a new plan for OSEP approval at a later date".

## 8 - Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must submit its sampling plan and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.  
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 66 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 cell (risk numerator) size = 10  
minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30

**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.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Revised baseline to 0% using FFY 2020 data to align with measurement table. Two AUs (1 correctional facility and 1 mental-health facility) were excluded from the calculation of this indicator due to not meeting the minimum n-size in any of the racial categories.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 65 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 cell (risk numerator) size = 10  
minimum n (risk denominator) size = 10

**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.**

In order to determine whether the disproportionate overrepresentation of White SED and Hispanic SLD students was the result of inappropriate identification, the CDE reviewed the AU’s policy, procedures, and practices relevant to identification, evaluation, and eligibility for compliance with IDEA and ECEA, as well as other data available through special education data collections and monitoring. The CDE also interviewed the Special Education Director to further explore practices to ensure students who speak a language other than English are assessed in native language, assessments are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory or racially biased, students are not found eligible based on limited English proficiency, and students are not found eligible under SLD as a primary result of cultural factors, environmental or economic disadvantage, or limited English proficiency.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Revised baseline to 0% using FFY 2020 data to align with measurement table. Three AUs (1 correctional facility, 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 84.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.91% | 98.00% | 98.03% | 98.39% | 95.70% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17,356 | 16,853 | 95.70% | 100% | 97.10% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

503

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

Out of the 503 children whose evaluations were not completed within the timeline, the shortest number of days beyond the timeline was 1 day and the longest was 361 days. The median number of days beyond the timeline was 153 days.  
  
503 children’s evaluations were delayed due to:  
• Additional evaluations or special valuations were needed  
• Staff missed the timeline  
• COVID-related school closures

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

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.**

Data for Indicator 11 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 11 are defined as: Date of Parental Consent to Evaluate, Date Evaluation Completed, and Reason for Delay in Completing the Evaluation.  
AUs report data for all children for whom Parental Consent to Evaluate have been received. When the evaluation is not completed within 60 calendar days, a reason for delay must be provided.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The previously noncompliant Administrative Units (AUs) submitted 12 months-worth of initial evaluation records that took place since the noncompliance was found. The CDE then reviewed the newly submitted data via desk audit and verified that all children reported during the timeframe were evaluated within the timeline. AUs who were not 100% compliant with this data review, then submitted an additional 2-months of initial evaluation records that took place after the 12-months of data. By reviewing and verifying these updated data, CDE ensured that the AUs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 11.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The CDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by having AUs that failed to meet compliance with Indicator 11 follow the below process:  
1. AUs received a pre-populated Indicator 11 Demonstration of Correction tracking form which lists each case of delayed initial evaluation record.  
2. AUs verified/reported the reason for the delay.  
3. If the IEP was finalized more than 90 days following the parental consent, AUs reported how they addressed the delay of services to ensure FAPE.  
 a. If the AU did not address the delay and the student was still within the AU, then the AU reported how it planned to address the delay of services to ensure FAPE.  
4. The CDE conducted a desk audit of the Indicator 11 Correction Trackers submitted by every noncompliant AU. The CDE reviewed and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and informed the AUs of the results.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

All of the required components have been addressed in the FFY2020 SPP/APR.

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # 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.

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 96.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.01% | 96.89% | 98.25% | 98.19% | 91.70% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 2,954 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 497 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 1,371 |
| d. Number 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. | 975 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 71 |
| 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 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 1,371 | 1,411 | 91.70% | 100% | 97.17% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

40

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

Out of the 40 children whose IEPs were not developed or implemented by their third birthdays, 7 children were found ineligible for services and 0 children’s eligibility was never determined during SY2020-21. Among the remaining 33 children, the shortest number of days beyond the 3rd birthday to implementation of IEPs was 2 days and the longest was 150 days. The median number of days beyond the 3rd birthday was 62 days.  
  
C-to-B transitions were delayed due to:  
• Additional evaluations or special valuations were needed  
• Staff missed the timeline  
• COVID-related school closures

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

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.**

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 developed or implemented by the child’s third birthday, a reason for delay must be provided.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The previously noncompliant Administrative Units (AUs) submitted 12 months-worth of C to B transition records that took place since the noncompliance was found. The CDE then reviewed the newly submitted data via desk audit and verified that all children reported during the timeframe were evaluated and had IEPs implemented before their third birthdays within the timeline. AUs who were not 100% compliant with this data review, then submitted an additional 2-months of C to B transition records that took place after the 12-months of data. By reviewing and verifying these updated data, CDE ensured that the AUs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 12.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The CDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by having AUs that failed to meet compliance with Indicator 12 follow the below process:  
  
1. AUs received a pre-populated Indicator 12 Demonstration of Correction tracking form which listed each case of delayed C-to-B transition records.  
2. AUs verified/reported the reason for the delay.  
3. AUs provided an explanation for how they ensured the delay did not result in denial of FAPE.  
 a. If the AU did not address the delay of services and the student was still within the AU, then the AU reported how it planned to address the delay.  
4. The CDE conducted a desk audit of the Indicator 12 Correction Trackers submitted by every noncompliant AU. The CDE reviewed and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and informed the AUs of the results.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

All of the required components have been addressed in the FFY2020 SPP/APR.

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 93.18% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 93.45% | 100.00% | 93.18% | 89.39% | 99.77% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 424 | 447 | 99.77% | 100% | 94.85% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Of the six noncompliant AUs, five of the six had a change in special education director and one of the six was a new AU with a new director. This leadership change combined with the impact of COVID 19 on school systems’ staff training schedule resulted in more noncompiant IEPs. New directors have identified the need to put in place a systemic accountability check in addition to additional staff training to improve compliance for this Indicator.

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

State monitoring

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

Annually, CDE conducts review of transition IEPs by tasking AUs to self-audit their transition IEPs independently and by conducting face-to-face or virtual transition IEP reviews in partnership with AUs. Prior to the school year, CDE randomly select students of transition age for AUs to review. AUs’ assigned number of IEPs to review vary between 5 and 10, depending on the student population size in the AU. AUs are required to self-review the selected IEPs by a due date within the Exceptional Student Services (ESSU) Data Management System (DMS), a web-based tool developed to provide AUs with a secure web-based location for managing and monitoring all business required for the implementation of IDEA. DMS prompts teams to review the transition IEPs using NTACT’s Indicator 13 review checklist. AUs are required to conduct the transition IEP reviews in partnership with CDE rather than self-reviewing when AUs are in the following circumstances:  
1. New AUs are required to participate in side-by-side Indicator 13 IEP reviews in the year they are established.  
2. AUs who self-report less than 100% compliance for Indicator 13 in a given year are required to participate in side-by-side reviews the following year.  
3. AUs who are selected to participate in the general supervision/monitoring visits are required to participate in side-by-side reviews.  
All transition IEP review results are compiled on the due date to determine the level of state’s and each AU’s compliance with Indicator 13.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | YES |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator | 15 |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

To verify that the Administrative Units (AUs) who reported noncompliance for Indicator 13 were correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13, the CDE’s Secondary Transition team in partnership with the AU special education team, conducted side-by-side compliance reviews of the required number of Transition IEPs during the 2020-2021 school year. The IEPs selected for this side-by-side compliance review were a different set of IEPs than the ones found noncompliant, in accordance with OSEP memo 09-02. These collaborative reviews were done virtually and involved reviewing and discussing each of the compliance elements of IEP to build capacity and inter-rater reliability within the AU staff until the IEP met the compliance target of 100%. The CDE verified that the IEPs reviewed were 100% compliant on-site with the AU and recorded this data in the ESSU Data Management System.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The CDE ensured that each AU corrected all individual cases of noncompliance related to Indicator 13, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, through the following process for each individual case of noncompliance:  
  
1. AUs were provided a pre-populated indicator 13 Demonstration of Correction tracking form including the student name, IEP date and reason for noncompliance  
2. AUs determined the root cause of the noncompliance   
3. AUs determined if each of the students was still in their jurisdiction.   
 a. If NO – no further correction was needed   
 b. If YES – AUs uploaded the student’s current IEP into the ESSU Data Management System  
4. AUs completed the IEP compliance record review of the student’s current IEP   
5. AUs completed the tracking form by recording the date the current IEP was reviewed and the reviewer’s name.   
  
The CDE verified correction via a desk audit process and confirmed the results to the AU.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The AU participated with CDE staff in collaborative IEP reviews for the SY2020-21 and met the target of 100% compliance. In addition, the AU developed and implemented meaningful improvement activities including new protocols, timelines, and an accountability system for the development and real-time reviews of IEPs involving district Professional Learning Communities, Special Education Coordinators, building principals, and case managers.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The CDE ensured that the AU corrected all individual cases of noncompliance related to Indicator 13, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the AU, through the following process for each individual case of noncompliance:  
  
1. The AU was provided a pre-populated indicator 13 Demonstration of Correction tracking form including the student name, IEP date and reason for noncompliance  
2. AU determined the root cause of the noncompliance   
3. AU determined if each of the students was still in their jurisdiction.   
 a. If NO – no further correction was needed   
 b. If YES – AU uploaded the student’s current IEP into the ESSU Data Management System  
4. AU completed the IEP compliance record review of the student’s current IEP   
5. AU completed the tracking form by recording the date the current IEP was reviewed and the reviewer’s name.   
  
The CDE verified correction via a desk audit process and confirmed the results to the AU.

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

All of the required components have been addressed in the FFY2020 SPP/APR.

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. 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);

4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2014 | Target >= | 32.50% | 32.75% | 32.75% | 33.00% | 27.70% |
| A | 24.62% | Data | 25.63% | 26.10% | 27.10% | 26.49% | 24.05% |
| B | 2014 | Target >= | 61.00% | 61.25% | 61.25% | 61.50% | 56.50% |
| B | 56.43% | Data | 60.44% | 61.85% | 68.70% | 67.64% | 68.74% |
| C | 2014 | Target >= | 69.00% | 69.25% | 69.25% | 69.50% | 81.40% |
| C | 73.60% | Data | 77.48% | 74.80% | 79.60% | 80.01% | 79.04% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 24.20% | 24.30% | 24.40% | 24.50% | 24.60% | 24.70% |
| Target B >= | 68.71% | 70.46% | 70.46% | 72.15% | 72.15% | 73.76% |
| Target C >= | 79.00% | 81.02% | 81.02% | 82.96% | 82.96% | 84.81% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 3,898 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 2,619 |
| Response Rate | 67.19% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 578 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 1,221 |
| 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) | 89 |
| 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). | 151 |

| **Measure** | **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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 578 | 2,619 | 24.05% | 24.20% | 22.07% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 1,799 | 2,619 | 68.74% | 68.71% | 68.69% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| 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) | 2,039 | 2,619 | 79.04% | 79.00% | 77.85% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | COVID-19 has had a significant impact on college enrollment nationally and in the state of Colorado. Nationally, undergraduate enrollment declined by 3.2% since fall 2020 and 3.4% in 2021. This is a 6.5% drop from 2019 pre-pandemic rates. Within the state of Colorado, there has been a 9% drop in enrollment, well below pre-pandemic rates. Many families faced economic and family stressors that have led to fewer student enrolling in community college. State data show that university undergraduate enrollment is also decreasing. These apply to students with and without disabilities. |
| **C** | COVID-19 has had a significant impact on college enrollment nationally and in the state of Colorado. Nationally, undergraduate enrollment declined by 3.2% since fall 2020 and 3.4% in 2021. This is a 6.5% drop from 2019 pre-pandemic rates. Within the state of Colorado, there has been a 9% drop in enrollment, well below pre-pandemic rates. State data show that university undergraduate enrollment is also decreasing. Many families faced economic and family stressors that have led to fewer students enrolling in 2- and 4- year colleges in the state. Though college enrollment decreased and impacts all outcome areas, competitive employment rates increased by 2%. This may be an indication that all students, including students with disabilities are taking time off to work, rather than attending college. |

**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.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 56.70% | 67.19% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

CDE will continue to provide training and accessible resources to all districts regarding strategies to increase student and family participation for all demographic groups, with an intentional focus on Black and Hispanic students in the Denver metro region. In addition, all AUs will receive the list of students to interview in advance of the start of the data collection period to enable them to review the list and update contact information. CDE will host PSO data discussions, root cause analysis and follow-up coaching sessions for all AUs. In addition, CDE will convene AU special education administrators in the targeted AUs in the Denver metro region to discuss strategies to improve response rates from Hispanic and African American former students. AUs in the Denver Metro region that have been successful in obtaining responses from these groups of students will be invited to discuss barriers and share the strategies they employ. AU special education administrators will leave the convening with a plan for how to increase response rates i.e., how to educate students and parents about the post-school outcome interview process, identify multiple means to contact families, and a plan to train staff. Additionally, CDE will provide targeted TA to AUs with low response rates. Given our success in improving participation rates by 10% from FFY2019 to FFY2020, including those for Black and Hispanic students, the same strategies will be used to ensure that Black and Hispanic students are represented in the future.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Response rates were examined by various demographic variables including race/ethnicity, districts, high school exit type, and disability category. Though all race/ethnic groups increased the response rates in FFY2020 compared to FFY2019, Black/African American former students’ response rate was still lower than other racial groups’ (White=70%, Hispanic/Latino=66%, Black/African-American=57%, Other=61%). Former students who dropped out was another group who marked a low response rate compared to other exit types (Regular Diploma=69%, Dropped out=50%, Reached maximum age = 83%, Certificate/Other=84%). Efforts to reach out to more Black/African-American former students and more former students who dropped out are discussed to in the sections below.

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

The following demographic categories were examined for their representativeness in the post-school outcome interviews: former students’ gender, race/ethnicity, disability, reasons for exiting secondary school, and attending AUs’ geographic region within the state. The chart below summarizes the results of the representativeness analysis. When the demographic group’s representation in the special education population and representation among the interview respondents were greater than ±3%, the representativeness was considered inadequate.   
  
The demographic categories that were not well-represented among the survey respondents were race/ethnicity, reasons exiting secondary school, and geographic region. White former students were overrepresented among the interview respondents, which seemed to be driven by the underrepresentation of Black, African American former students. Though Colorado has had underrepresentation of Hispanic and Black, African American former students for years, these groups increased their participation rates by greater than 10% from FFY2019 to FFY2020, which reduced the overrepresentation of White former students in FFY2020. Former students who exited secondary schools due to graduating with regular high school diplomas were overrepresented among the interview participants, which seemed to be driven by the underrepresentation of former students who exited secondary schools due to dropping out of high schools. The dropped-out former students’ participation rates increased by 11% from FFY2019 to FFY2020. This reduced the underrepresentation of this group as well as the overrepresentation of the graduated former students compared to the previous year. Finally, former students from the Denver metro region were significantly underrepresented among the interview respondents, while former students from North Central and Pikes Peak were overrepresented. This is the trend Colorado has been seeing for years. Denver metro AUs has the highest enrollment of students with disabilities who are Black, African American. The poor participation from the Denver metro districts’ former students seemed to have exacerbated the poor representation of the regions as well as racial categories.  
  
Category -----------------------------------------------– Interview Respondents –- Population Representation –- ±Difference –- Representative (<±3%)?  
  
Former Students’ Gender   
Male …………………………………………………………..61.70% …………..…… 62.75% …………..…… -1.04% …………..…… Yes  
Female ………………………………………...……….…… 38.30% …………….… 37.25% …………...…… -1.04% …………..…… Yes  
  
Race/Ethnicity  
American Indian or Alaska Native ……….....….…….…… 0.84% …………..….… 1.16% ……….…...…… -0.32% …………..…… Yes  
Asian ………………………………………...………….…… 1.45% ………..…….… 1.54% …………....…… -0.09% …………..…… Yes  
Black or African American ………………………………… 4.89% …..………….… 7.08% …………….…… -2.19% …………..…… Yes  
Hispanic or Latino ……………………………………….… 38.37% ………….…… 39.29% ………………… -0.91% …………..…… Yes  
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander …………….… 0.11% ………………… 0.15% …………....…… -0.03% …………..…… Yes  
Two or More Races ………………………………………… 3.13% …………..….… 3.69% …………....…… -0.56% …………..…… Yes  
White ………………………………………….……….…… 51.20% ……………..… 47.10% …………...….… 4.10% ….………...…… No  
  
Disability   
Autism Spectrum Disorder ………………..…………..…… 8.93% ………………… 7.91% …….….…......... 1.03% …….……..…… Yes  
Intellectual Disability/Multiple Disability………………….. 10.88% ………………… 9.90% ……………....... 0.98% ………..….…… Yes  
Other Health Impairment ……………………....…………. 13.78% …………….…. 13.76% ………………... 0.03% ……….……..… Yes  
Serious Emotional Disability ………………………………. 7.18% ……………….… 8.69% ………….…..... -1.52% ………..…….… Yes  
Specific Learning Disability …………….……………….... 54.75% ….……….….… 55.61% ……………..... -0.86% …….…….….… Yes  
Other ………………………………………………..……….. 4.47% ……………….… 4.13% …………........... 0.34% ………..….…… Yes  
  
Reasons Exiting Secondary School  
Regular Diploma ……………………………….………..… 86.64% ………..……… 81.36% …………........... 5.27% ………..……..… No  
Certificate …………………………………………………..... 1.37% .....……………. 1.10% ……………......... 0.27% ………..……… Yes  
Reached Maximum Age …………..………………..……… 1.26% ……………..…. 0.95% …………..…....... 0.31% ………..…...… Yes  
Dropped Out …………………………….……….………… 10.73% ……….………. 16.58% ……………....... -5.85% …….………..… No  
  
Region  
Denver Metro …………………………………….………… 42.84% …………......... 55.56% ……...………. -12.72% ……...………… No  
North Central …………………….………………........…… 15.35% ……..………... 12.25% ………….…….. 3.10% ………………… No  
Northeast …………………………….……………………… 3.02% …………………. 1.65% ..……....……..... 1.37% …...…………… Yes  
Northwest ………………………………….………………… 5.31% ….……………... 3.85% ………....…..…. 1.46% ………...……… Yes  
Pikes Peak ……………………………….…………....…… 19.17% …………..….... 15.87% ……….....……. 3.30% …………...….… No  
Southeast …………………………………….……………… 1.91% …………………. 2.16% ……….………. -0.26% ……….……….. Yes  
Southwest ………………………….………………………… 3.17% ……..….………. 2.48% ……………..…. 0.69% ……….……….. Yes  
West Central ………………………………………………… 6.64% …………..…….. 5.23% …………..…..… 1.42% …………..…… Yes  
Other (online, multi-site charter) ……………..……...….… 2.60% ….……..………. 0.95% ….……….….…. 1.64% ….……………. Yes

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

As discussed above, White former students were overrepresented among the interview respondents, which seemed to be driven by the underrepresentation of Black, African American former students, and to the lesser extent, Hispanic former students. Black and Hispanic students and the poor participation of former students who exited from Denver metro districts are related issues with which Colorado has struggled for a long time. The Denver metro region accounted for 80.4% of Black former students who exited from high school with IEPs, and also accounted for 60.6% of Hispanic former students who exited from high school with IEPs. Thus, increasing the participation rates among former students who exited from Denver metro districts has been an utmost concern in the recent years. In fact, CDE met with district leaders to discuss factors that may have contributed to the underrepresentation of identified groups in the past year. CDE will keep focusing on increasing the representation of Black and Hispanic students in the Denver metro region.  
  
CDE will continue to provide training and accessible resources to all districts regarding strategies to increase student and family participation for all demographic groups, with an intentional focus on Black and Hispanic students in the Denver metro region. In addition, all AUs will receive the list of students to interview in advance of the start of the data collection period to enable them to review the list and update contact information. CDE will host PSO data discussions, root cause analysis and follow-up coaching sessions for all AUs. In addition, CDE will convene AU special education administrators in the targeted AUs in the Denver metro region to discuss strategies to improve response rates from Hispanic and African American former students. AUs in the Denver Metro region that have been successful in obtaining responses from these groups of students will be invited to discuss barriers and share the strategies they employ. AU special education administrators will leave the convening with a plan for how to increase response rates i.e., how to educate students and parents about the post-school outcome interview process, identify multiple means to contact families, and a plan to train staff. Additionally, CDE will provide targeted TA to AUs with low response rates. Given our success in improving participation rates by 10% from FFY2029 to FFY2020, including those for Black and Hispanic students, the same strategies will be used to ensure that Black and Hispanic students are represented in the future.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

Depending on the number of high school exiters in the Administrative Unit (AU), Colorado uses a combination of census and stratified sampling for indicator 14 data collection. When AUs have 100 or fewer students who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, the AUs interview all exiters (i.e., census). When AUs have 100-200 exiters, they receive a list of 100 randomly selected former students to interview. AUs with more than 200 exiters receive a list of 200 randomly selected former students to interview. If the AU wishes to interview all former students, rather than a sample, the state accommodates for that.   
  
Colorado had 5,493 secondary school exiters with IEPs in SY2019-20. Out of them, 3,954 were selected as interviewees, following the methodology described above. Out of the 3,954 former students, 56 were found to be deceased, returned to high schools, or could not be reached due to incarceration. Out of the remaining 3,898 students, 2,619 students participated in the interview. This means that the interviewed former students accounted for approximately 48% of all former students who had IEPs at the time of leaving secondary school.  
  
Colorado's sampling methodology made it possible to reduce the sample size required to achieve randomness, and made the proportionate representation in the sample more likely.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Sampling plan - Colorado made its best effort to locate our most recent approved sampling plan and were unable to find one. We will continue to collect data for this Indicator using sampling and will submit a new plan for OSEP approval at a later date.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

All of the required components have been addressed in the FFY2020 SPP/APR.

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, OSEP required the State to submit its sampling plan to and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan. The State did not provide its sampling plan but reported, "Colorado made its best effort to locate our most recent approved sampling plan and were unable to find one. We will continue to collect data for this Indicator using sampling and will submit a new plan for OSEP approval at a later date".

## 14 - Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 APR, the State must submit its sampling plan and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.  
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 6 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 2 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 50.00% | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |
| Data | 50.00% | 62.50% | 54.55% | 54.55% | 55.56% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 6 | 55.56% |  | 33.33% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Because States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10, Colorado will set these elements when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 45 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 10 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 12 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

• Identify CDE internal stakeholders and content experts for each indicator   
• Schedule meetings for each CDE internal stakeholder indicator team  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team, explain rules and parameters, Colorado history of indicator, discuss past and Current improvement strategies: facilitate discussion and solicit feedback  
• Develop options for targets  
• Meet with each CDE stakeholder team to facilitate discussion and come to consensus on targets and improvement strategies to present to the external stakeholder groups  
• Request and collect improvement strategies for each indicator from each CDE internal stakeholder team   
• Build a response tool/survey to collect evidence and information from external stakeholder groups and the public  
o Targets too high, too low, just right  
o If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
o If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
o School district represented  
o Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
o Contact information (email)  
• Build a web page to include:  
o Basics of SPP/APR and the 6-year target resetting process  
o A series of webinars explaining each of the Indicators, proposed targets, and improvement strategies  
o A link to an indicator survey to gather information from the public comment period  
? Targets too high, too low, just right  
? If the proposed improvement strategies are reasonably expected to help Colorado reach the proposed targets.  
? If the proposed choice of demographic category to be analyzed for representation is an appropriate selection  
? School district represented  
? Role (e.g., parent of a SWD, teacher, advocate, student, community member) – allow for multiple roles to be checked  
? Contact information (email)  
• Present and seek input on agreed on targets and improvement strategies to indicator specific advisory councils: Preschool School Special Education Advisory Committee (PSSEAC), and the Secondary Transition Task Force Advisory Committee  
• Incorporate all input/feedback and share proposed version with ESSU Executive Director  
• Present proposed targets to State advisory groups: Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee (CSEAC) and Parent Partnerships for Equity Advisory Committee, and parent advocacy groups: The Arc of Colorado, PEAK Parent Center, Disability Law Colorado, and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys   
• Present proposed targets for all indicators to Colorado LEA Special Education Directors at the Fall Directors’ Meeting and solicit/gather input through the indicator surveys  
• Hold a 2-month public comment period - Solicit public comments through a broad CDE-wide communication plan: dedicated webpage with short videos and surveys for each indicator, CDE Facebook page, CDE Twitter Account, CDE webpage news story, CDE’s Weekly Newsletter, “The Scoop”, notifications to our parent advocacy agencies   
• Review and consider public comments received through the indicator survey mechanism  
• Finalize all targets with ESSU Executive Director  
• Submit SPP/APR   
• Publish the final SPP/APR on the CDE website

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 54.35% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 61.00% | 62.00% | 63.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% |
| Data | 72.73% | 65.52% | 62.96% | 54.35% | 56.82% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 54.35% | 54.35% | 54.35% | 54.35% | 54.35% | 54.35% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 12 | 45 | 56.82% | 54.35% | 48.89% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

While our state is beginning to see some increase in the rate of agreements related to DPCs, we are now experiencing some decrease in the rate of agreement for mediations not related to DPCs. It is difficult to pinpoint the reason for this change and for continued slippage on this indicator. However, we believe the reasons stated in previous years remain to be the primary reasons for slippage: 1) our state is still recovering from the change in our mediation system from the evaluative model used by ALJs, to a facilitative model used by independent contract mediators; 2) we believe mediation is used by the parties at a late, intractable stage resulting in higher impasse rates.  
We also continue to see a high impasse rate (73%) for one attorney in our state who is involved in 24% of mediations held for this reporting period.   
Colorado is engaging in the following activities to improve the mediation agreement rate: 1) an online mediation evaluation has been implemented, and we are conducting periodic reviews to address any concerns, 2) a mediator self-evaluation has been implemented to identify factors related to Impasse, 3) the CDE is convening mediators to discuss concerns and solutions related to impasse, 4) the CDE plans to hold a mediation training in the next fiscal year by a national speaker experienced in special education mediation, and 5) the CDE will also be convening a dispute resolution advisory group to explore improvements to all three IDEA processes.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Colorado changed the baseline year from FFY2005 to FFY2018. This is because Colorado started using contractors to conduct mediations in FFY2018, impacting the comparability of the data before and after FFY2018.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts the baseline.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

Colorado students in first grade\* who are identified at the beginning of the school year as Well Below Benchmark according to the DIBELS Next Assessment, will significantly improve their reading proficiency as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students who are identified at the end of the school year as Well Below Benchmark.  
  
\*Who attend one of the SSIP project schools  
\*Based upon the Structured Literacy Project

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

Students in first grade who attend one of the SSIP project schools.

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

If we create an aligned professional learning system from pre-service learning at universities – through initial licensure – to on-going professional development opportunities …  
AND, provide professional learning and technical assistance related to language and literacy instruction for current teams of K-3 grade special educators, general educators, and leaders …  
AND, provide professional learning and opportunities to examine and use strategies to braid federal funds …  
THEN, our pre-service candidates, newly licensed educators, and current educators will have increased knowledge and skills to teach language and literacy to K-3 students … so that  
THEN our students who are in K-3 will improve their reading proficiency by the end of the third grade.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the** **decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

Data collection, prior to COVID, showed a positive trajectory. The pandemic has made effective data collection difficult, but we have continued to make every effort to collect project data and to fully implement project activities. As return to in-person learning resumes and absenteeism drops, the data will be more available and reliable. Also, implementation of the project, as designed, will resume.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2015 | 26.34% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 35.01% | 34.00% | 32.00% | 30.00% | 28.00% | 26.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Students who remained in Well Below Benchmark at the end of the school year** | **Students in Well Below Benchmark at the beginning of the school year** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 272 | 777 |  | 35.01% | 35.01% | Met target | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Acadience (DiBELS Next)

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

We collected end-of-year benchmark data from the Acadience Assessments using the Amplify data collection system. The analysis included review of first-grade students who fell into the well-below established benchmark range on the Beginning-of-the Year (BOY) and End-of-the Year (EOY) Benchmarks.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Using the Amplify Progress Planning Tool for mCLASS© DIBELS Next©, that utilizes data from across the nation for a meaningful comparative perspective regarding progress, the Project considered the overall growth at EOY. According to this comparative data, the Project made well-below average progress when comparing first-grade students’ BOY 2020 benchmark data (40%) to EOY 2020 benchmark data (35%).

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

1) Data Completeness: The Project collected data during the FFY2020 at the prescribed data points. However, the data completeness was heavily impacted by high levels of absenteeism tied to school closures, suspension of in-person learning, and challenges with remote learning. There were validity and reliability concerns with the collected data due to the challenges of consistent, continual, and fully accessible instruction and the occasional administration of assessments through a virtual format when the standard administration format was designed to be conducted in-person.  
  
2) Data Collection Challenges: As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, not all first-grade students in Project schools were participating in in-person learning sessions during the beginning-of-the year and end-of-year data collection windows and inconsistent attendance and accessibility to virtual platforms was a continual concern throughout the entire school year. Unfortunately, the impact of the pandemic was not equal among all student groups, and those most vulnerable to academic risk often experienced the greatest impact.   
  
3) Mitigation Plan: Staff at each of the Project schools worked with Project coaches and reached out to families to increase in-person attendance at schools during data collection intervals as well as for all in-person learning intervals. In-person and virtual attendance was monitored closely and families requiring support were contacted throughout the year. Beginning-of-the-year data suggested substantial learning loss had occurred since the onset of pandemic. Project coaches continued to create and support the use of effective virtual learning tools, provided assistance with intensifying Structured Literacy routines for use during all in-person learning, and closely monitored the timely administration of the DIBELS Next Progress Monitoring.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/ssip\_colorado\_phase2

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

As we began the 20-21 SY, we planned to resume the infrastructure improvement strategies from our findings during the 19-20 SY that were interrupted by the pandemic. We had planned to address the need to provide special education providers and interventionists additional professional development; 2) collaborate with school leadership in creating weekly/daily master scheduled that better met the need of students requiring additional and intensified literacy instruction; 3) supporting special education teachers and interventionists in grouping students for small group interventions more effectively; and 4) assist teachers and interventionists in establishing meaningful student goals and instructional expectations. As the pandemic continued into the 20-21 SY, the Structured Literacy team in collaboration with our partnering schools and districts shifted their focus to supporting teachers in delivering daily Structured Literacy lessons either in-person or virtually for all students. Due to health and safety restrictions, the Structured Literacy coaches were prohibited from conducting in-person coaching and pivoted to working with teachers in the planning and delivery of Structured Literacy virtually. At the request of district leadership, the team did not require participation of teachers and interventionists in any additional small or large-group professional development outside of their one-one virtual coaching.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

As a result of the significant interruption to normal school and instructional operations, we cannot report on outcomes related to our plans to add specific infrastructure improvements to enhance student outcomes and better align instruction across all tiers of instruction.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Observations and experiences during the 19-20 SY reporting cycle and within the varied intervention settings in the participating schools produced five common trends. It was planned and expected that these trends would be the focus of our work to address our concern for increasing outcomes for students, whose performance at the beginning the school year fell into the Well-Below Benchmark range of performance on the Acadience assessment (DIBELS Next). The anticipated outcomes were a mastery of the skills, sufficient time provided, and high expectations of all learners. As a result of the significant interfering impact the pandemic created in addressing these trends, these issues remain at the forefront of our next steps for the next reporting cycle. The trends and next steps include:  
  
1. Trend: Intervention staff were not as well-prepared in their understanding of the ‘science of reading’ and the structure of the English language as expected. Like their classroom counterparts, they have not experienced the level of pre-service and in-service training required to address the complex and intensive needs of the most struggling readers. Next Steps: Professional development for special education teachers covering a range of instructional strategies, i.e., phoneme -grapheme mapping, sound walls, word summing, building word matrixes, etc. and alternate lesson planning and routines. Intensifying and individualize strategies to enhance the outcomes of IEP students with specific reading disabilities.  
  
2. Trend: Intervention and small group schedules did not consistently allow for adequate time to deliver effective Structured Literacy lessons and practice to the degree that is essential to support growth in struggling readers. In some instances, intervention was frequently canceled as staff completed other assigned responsibilities, impacting the consistency and continuity of instruction for student who require daily and consistent instruction to assure reading growth. Next Steps: Continued work with Principals to recognize the importance of identifying individual student needs, adjusting schedules, and prioritizing the dedicated time to provide intensive interventions as required.  
  
3. Trend: While reading was the most common demonstrated need among students identified with mild-moderate disabilities, specially designed instruction (special education) typically did not include the time and intensity required to further these students’ literacy skills. Instructional time was frequently split between multiple IEP Goals in multiple academic areas, leaving little time for intensive literacy instruction and practice. Next Steps: Identification of specially designed instructional strategies to intensify Structured Literacy intervention for students with IEPs identified with specific reading disabilities.  
  
4. Trend: Instructional leaders lacked the understanding of the conditions that must be met to support literacy growth among the most at-risk students, including students with disabilities. Next Steps: Continued work with district and building leadership to address conditions in schools that create barriers for at-risk students to improve reading.  
  
5. Trend: The minimizing effect of low expectations, most specifically for students with disabilities and those with other significant risk factors that might interfere with the acquisition of early foundational reading skills, i.e., poverty, limited early language experiences, etc. permeated the learning environments in which these students participate. Next Steps: Continued work with leadership and instructional staff to encourage higher expectations of all learners regardless of circumstances.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

1) Direct explicit instruction; 2) alignment of instruction across all tiers of instruction: 3) consistent use of well-sequenced curricula, 4) provision of embedded coaching; and 5) consistent use of data to inform instructional adjustments.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

1. The Project continues to emphasize direct and explicit structured literacy instruction to enhance students’ understanding of the structure of the English language and build essential foundational reading/spelling skills. Daily routines are established for whole group and small group instruction.  
  
2. The daily use of Structured Literacy routines, common instructional language, and consistent scope and sequence of instruction is emphasized across all-tier of instruction to accelerate student participation and growth and minimize student confusion as they participate in an increasingly intensified continuum of service.  
  
3. The Project trains all participating teacher in the use of the Project’s specifically designed Scope and Sequence of instruction to assure developmentally appropriate instruction, alignment to State standards and grade-appropriate instruction, and consistency with current reading research.  
  
4. The Project, since its inception, has been designed to support instructional staff with effective professional learning opportunities that are both consistent in content and expectations, but are also customized to meet each individual teacher’s professional learning needs. Teachers are coached by experienced literacy coaches to enhance their use and understanding of a Structured Literacy approach and to promote fidelity to the Project’s design and instructional goals.  
  
5. Project effectiveness and student growth are predicated on the use of data to inform instructional practices and program adjustments. The Project consistently administers Acadience Benchmark Assessment and Progress Monitoring. Date is collected and data meeting are routinely scheduled to discuss student outcomes and determine if instructional adjustments are necessary.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

The use of listed evidence-based practices is supported by current reading research and have been carefully implemented to affect change in teacher’s instructional behavior and increase student outcomes. In some instances, Project success as measured by improved student outcomes, has resulted in significant changes to district-wide literacy instruction and the adoption of instructional practices and resources that are aligned with the Project and the ‘science of reading’. Unfortunately, the pandemic has made Project implementation more challenging as instruction has fluctuated between in-person and virtual formats and effective student grouping has been impacted by COVID safety protocols  
  
The emphasis on direct and explicit instruction has resulted in observable changes in the way teachers design and deliver their daily instruction. It has allowed teachers to effectively provide instruction in whole group and small group setting in ways that students can demonstrate understanding and daily formative assessment can inform future instruction and intervention.  
  
The alignment of direct and explicit instruction and the consistent use of common instructional language across all tiers of instruction has increased student participation in activities that they readily understand and has provided the necessary frequent and distributed practice that is essential to young readers who require additional instructional supports.  
  
Instructional staff have been provided with a scope and sequence of instruction that allows K-3 students to master the simple and consistent elements of the English language before they are introduced to the more variant and complex concepts. The Scope and Sequence is used as a framework upon which other resources are aligned, assuring adequate content coverage, practice, and alignment.  
  
Teachers participating in the Project are supported in their own learning and in their implementation of Structured Literacy in their classroom through personalized instructional coaching that is provided by the Project’s literacy coaches. Coaches are able to model and demonstrate effective instructional routines, strategies and practices in teacher’s classroom. They are able to observe whole group and small group implementation, help guide teachers’ instructional choices, interpret data and suggest instructional adjustments, and monitor fidelity.  
  
Even the most effect instruction requires adjustment based on student need. The continuous use of progress monitoring and formative assessment are essential components of the Structured Literacy Project and when paired with professional learning in interpreting assessment results and using data to inform instruction, students benefit. This evidence-based practice has resulted in Project schools formalizing processes for data collection and review.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

The impact of the pandemic has been most noticeable in our ability to effectively monitor project fidelity. Our project schools, like their counterparts across the nation, have been impacted by staff shortages, fluctuating instructional formats, higher student absenteeism, controlled and inflexible student grouping related to health-safety protocols, and varied accessibility to virtual learning related to economic and social factors that are present in at-risk schools.  
  
District and school leaders asked for our collaboration and cooperation in limiting the number of tasks teachers were asked to participate in and/or complete. As a result, we did not ask school leaders or instructional staff to complete surveys as it was already known that issues of inconsistent staffing, inaccessible instruction, high absenteeism, and instructional grouping restrictions had impacted Project fidelity as demonstrated in prior years. Project literacy coaches consistently observed whole group and small group instruction, flexing from in-person to mostly virtual observation due to health safety protocols. They supported teachers in implementing Structured Literacy and all essential routine and practices amidst the every- changing environmental and health conditions.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Progress monitoring and formative data collected by literacy coaches during this reporting cycle continued to show the significant impact the pandemic had on Project activities and implementation. Data from this reporting cycle suggested that inability to implement all Project activities and strategies and to make scheduling and grouping adjustments to small group instruction impacted student outcomes.  
  
Data prior to the onset of the pandemic in the spring of 2019 supported the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice. Schools had experienced increases in overall literacy performance and the Project documented positive growth among students initially within the Below Benchmark and Benchmark ranges. These positive growth trends showed greater numbers of students moving into the Well-Above Benchmark range.   
  
At the onset of the 19-20 SY, Project staff addressed the need to accelerate the upward growth of students in the Well-Below Benchmark by initiating a number of Project adjustments. These included more direct and purposeful professional development for Special Education and Intervention teachers, with the goal of enhancing their practice and delivery of direct and explicit instruction. This increase in teacher learning was accompanied by a restructuring of the Project’s literacy coaches and an increased emphasis on embedded coaching during small group instruction and intervention. Project staff observed positive changes, albeit small, as they implemented increased coaching and professional learning supports for those charged with the instruction of the most at-risk young readers. Unfortunately, the effect of the pandemic significant interfered and stopped our work in realigning intervention schedules, implementing effective student grouping for small group instruction, providing intensified professional development, and establishing higher expectations for student with disabilities and those with at-risk factors. As previously mentioned, the impact of the pandemic has been the most evident and unkind to those experiencing poverty, significant health-risks before COVID, unstable living conditions, and the need for the highest caliber of individualized and specially designed instruction paired with frequent and distributed practice.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

In the Spring of 2021, the Structured Literacy staff began planning a return to ‘more normal’ learning conditions and a reset of the changes briefly initiated to enhance small group instructional practices and increase professional development for special educators and interventionists. Since the earlier identified adjustments and activities were not realized as a result of the pandemic, there is no conclusive evidence that these strategies and plans will not be effective when fully implemented. In addition, the Structured Literacy team has developed intensified instructional routines and adjustments to daily instruction to boost and accelerate student growth as schools embark on recovering some of the expected growth lost during this unprecedented time of educational interruption.   
  
The use of direct, explicit, and evidence-based instruction that is supported by effective data collection and interpretation will be essential to our goals of realigning all instruction across all tiers of instruction. We will continue to align instructional activities, strategies, and resources to our Project instructional sequence and support implementation with fidelity through the continued use of embedded coaching. Our return to our enhanced focus on small group instruction, and those professionals who provide this instruction, will support increased reading growth among the most challenged young readers. We anticipate that consistent use of our evidenced-based practices, a recommitment to implementation fidelity, and focus on effective   
scheduling, grouping, and instruction for the most struggling early readers will return the Structured Literacy Project and student outcomes to the positive trajectory established before the pandemic.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

CDE worked with NCSI to specifically convene stakeholders to address Colorado on April 23, 2021, to review and assess the project. Staff from NCSI served as neutral facilitators so that CDE staff could observe and participate in the process. Stakeholders included in this convening included the project’s literacy coaches, classroom teachers, special education providers, district leadership, and campus leadership. During the course of the convening stakeholders were asked to provide feedback in four areas:   
  
1.) What has worked most effectively with the SSIP’s improvement efforts?   
2.) What did not work?  
3.) What is the current level of support around literacy support for students with disabilities offered by CDE?  
4.) What are the threats to ongoing improvement efforts?  
5.) What do you hope CDE will address in the SSIP moving forward?  
  
Through these five questions stakeholders indicated that the SSIP helped to facilitate collaboration at the school level and between CDE and schools. The project has built capacity among both general education teachers and special educations teachers. One of the areas stakeholders identified as a weakness was related to the transition from direct support from CDE to implementing the project on their own at the district level. In fact, this was identified as a primary threat to the ongoing improvement efforts. Implementing structured literacy is intense and stakeholder noted that both funding and staff capacity were both significant issues for them in moving the project forward with direct support from CDE. In terms of instructional support for students with disabilities, stakeholders noted that the implementation of structured literacy was effective for students with disabilities, but that direct support within the project for this population could be improved. Finally, stakeholders expressed the desire for CDE to work with higher education to provide future teachers with the support they need to effectively teach reading at the elementary level.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

As noted above, CDE worked with NCSI to provide facilitation for focus groups. Individuals selected for the focus group were purposefully selected to ensure multiple perspectives from sites that had been part of previous implementation or had direct involvement in the project. Included in the focus groups were classroom general education teachers, special education teachers, campus principals, university deans, and special education directors. CDE worked with NCSI to develop a set of uniform questions that would be presented to both the entire group and to smaller, subset of the group. Information collected from the focus group is currently being utilized as CDE considers potential modification to the project.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Of primary concern to stakeholders was the ability to maintain the project once direct support from CDE is discontinued at the end of the project. CDE is currently engaged, with the support of NCSI, to make changes to the project which will seek to address the concerns expressed by stakeholders. Currently, CDE is considering how improved use of cohort groups could be used to facilitate capacity building at the local level.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

There are no new implementation activities.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

1. Add a narrative description of the current Theory of Action.  
If we create an aligned professional learning system from pre-service learning at universities – through initial licensure – to on-going professional development opportunities …  
AND, provide professional learning and technical assistance related to language and literacy instruction for current teams of K-3 grade special educators, general educators, and leaders …  
AND, provide professional learning and opportunities to examine and use strategies to braid federal funds …  
THEN, our pre-service candidates, newly licensed educators, and current educators will have increased knowledge and skills to teach language and literacy to K-3 students … so that  
THEN our students who are in K-3 will improve their reading proficiency by the end of the third grade.   
2. Explain discrepancy regarding “subset of the population”.   
The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) inadvertently reported that a subset of the population was not being used when we should have reported that a subset was used. The overall State Systemic Improvement Plan is a K-3 literacy project. Prior to reporting for FY 2019, the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) was inclusive of grades K-3 but was changed in CDE’s submission for FY 2019. Since CDE is now only reporting on students in first grade who attend one of the SSIP project schools, CDE’s response should have indicated that we were using a subset of the total population involved in the project.

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**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.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

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:**

Paul Foster

**Title:**

Executive Director of Exceptional Student Services

**Email:**

foster\_p@cde.state.co.us

**Phone:**

7206604253

**Submitted on:**

04/27/22 12:22:02 PM

# ED Attachments



1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)