

# CO Part C

# FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

**Executive Summary:**

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**General Supervision System:**

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

The Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) is the lead agency for planning and implementing the federal Part C grant. Within the CDHS, the Office of Early Childhood (OEC), Division of Community and Family Support (DCFS), Early Intervention Colorado program (EI program) is responsible for the administration of the statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system of EI services for infants and toddlers with developmental delays or disabilities and their families.

The work of the EI program is guided by a general supervision system that consists of nine components designed to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, including accountability for fiscal management, and that EI services have a positive impact on Colorado's children and families.

**Rules, Policies and Procedures**

The CDHS, with stakeholder input, develops rules, policies and procedures that support and provide clarification of state and federal statutes to ensure effective implementation of Early Intervention (EI) services at the local level statewide.

State rules are developed by EI program staff with input from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC), Community Centered Boards (CCB) and other key stakeholders. The rules are reviewed and approved by the Department of Human Services Board with input from the Office of the Attorney General.

The *Early Intervention Colorado State Plan* encompasses policies and procedures necessary for implementing the Federal Part C of IDEA regulations (34 C.F.R. Part 303), the Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), Title 27, Article 10.5, Part 7, Colorado Code of Regulations (CCR) 12, 2509-10, 7.900-7.994 and other applicable state and federal regulations related to EI services.

The *Early Intervention Colorado State Plan* is reviewed annually by the EI program staff and Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC) and revised as needed. Any revisions made to policies and procedures in the *Early Intervention Colorado State Plan* or state rules are made available for specified public review and comment periods in compliance with the State's notice of public hearings and dissemination plan as defined in Section I of the *Early Intervention Colorado State Plan*.

Rules, policies and procedures are distributed statewide to all the local EI programs at the 20 CCBs, the CICC and other key stakeholders and are available to the public on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org).

**The Early Intervention Colorado State Performance Plan**

The CDHS, in collaboration with the CICC, CCBs, and other key stakeholders, develops, and revises as needed, a State Performance Plan (SPP) that spans a time period specified by the Federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The SPP addresses 11 federally required indicators, sets annual targets and details improvement strategies to meet those targets.

Once final revisions have been made by the CDHS, the SPP is submitted on or before the date specified by the OSEP, usually February 1st.

The SPP establishes the actions that the CDHS takes to meet the annual targets and improvement activities. These activities are reviewed annually with the CICC, CCBs, and community partners who may provide training and technical assistance and other key stakeholders to determine if revisions are needed.

The CICC establishes Special Purpose Committees within the CICC to work on SPP priority areas when needed to ensure successful implementation of EI services.

**The Early Intervention Colorado Annual Performance Report**

Each year the CDHS submits an Annual Performance Report (APR) on or before the date specified by the OSEP, usually February 1st. The APR addresses the 11 indicators that are described in the SPP. The APR functions as a report on the progress or slippage in meeting the requirements for the statewide EI program based on performance in the previous fiscal year. The APR also documents progress on improvement activities and reports on timely correction of noncompliance by local programs in the 20 CCBs.

Data for the APR are generated from the following sources:

- A. Desk audits of data collected through the statewide EI program data system;
- B. Data collected through the EI Provider Database;
- C. Data collected through the annual Family Outcomes Survey;
- D. Reports of dispute resolution; and,
- E. Status of timely correction of noncompliance.

The CICC is involved in the review of the APR prior to submission and certifies the document as its official annual report to the OSEP.

**Local Early Intervention Program Performance Profiles**

Annually, the CDHS conducts a desk audit and measures the compliance and performance of each CCB on Indicators 1-8 of the SPP and publicly reports this information on an individual *Early Intervention Program Performance Profile*.

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

For Indicators 1-8, the CDHS uses the *Early Intervention Program Performance Profile* to report the performance of each CCB on the following:

- A. Current data;
- B. Current data performance in relation to state targets and CCBs of similar size using percentage measurements;
- C. Ranking of CCB performance in comparison to other CCBs of similar size; and,
- D. A description of whether the CCB met the target, made progress or slipped.

The CCB *Early Intervention Program Performance Profile* also includes:

- A. The status determination;
- B. Demographic information about the CCB;
- C. The geographic area that is covered by the CCB; and,
- D. Contact information for the CCB.

A statement is provided by the CDHS regarding timely correction of noncompliance, timely submission of fiscal audits, completion of local interagency operating agreements and timely submission of valid and reliable data. CCBs are given the opportunity to provide a statement regarding their performance during the previous year.

The OSEP requires the CDHS to enforce IDEA by making status determinations annually on the performance of each CCB EI program using the same four categories that the OSEP uses in making the state status determination and consider the following:

- A. Performance on compliance indicators;
- B. Whether data submitted by the CCB EI program are valid, reliable and timely;
- C. Uncorrected noncompliance; and,
- D. Any audit findings.

In addition, the CDHS also considers:

- A. Progress toward performance indicator targets;
- B. Timely submission of fiscal audits; and,
- C. Completion of local interagency operating agreements.

A CCB's status determination informs the level of technical assistance and/or corrective action that is required for the local program.

The CCB *Early Intervention Program Performance Profiles* are posted on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org) and distributed to stakeholders each spring.

### Data Collection and Verification

The CDHS uses an online data system and billing system that allows real time reporting at the local and state level. The CDHS uses the data system to gather data for federal and state reporting, monitoring of local programs, verification of timely correction of noncompliance, billing for direct services, performance tracking and for a variety of management functions. Desk audits are conducted by the EI program staff to analyze progress or slippage on key Indicators, monitor compliance for federal, state and local reporting, fiscal compliance, inform monitoring and technical assistance activities. The *Early Intervention Data Instructions* document is provided to the CCBs and posted on the website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org) to provide guidance for data entry requirements and definitions.

The EI program data system includes demographic information and referral, eligibility and Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) data, allowing a wide array of performance tracking and management reports to be generated at the state and local levels. The data system also includes direct service expenditure information for state and federal funding resources that is used to inform fiscal management, legislative reports, monitoring actions and technical assistance activities. EI program staff conducts data verification during onsite CCB monitoring visits to check the validity and reliability of data entered into the EI program data system.

Reports are generated through the EI program data system for the federally required Section 618 data tables and are submitted to meet the April and November reporting deadlines. These data are also published on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org), as required.

Data reports are run annually to inform the APR. EI Colorado staff reviews the APR data to:

- A. Determine if a finding of noncompliance should be issued to a CCB;
- B. Verify whether data demonstrate noncompliance, and issue a finding if data demonstrate noncompliance; or,
- C. Review more current data to verify that the CCB has corrected any noncompliance identified in the APR desk audit, in which case a finding of noncompliance would not be issued.

EI program staff generates data reports that look at trends across a number of data elements for a number of years. Trend reports include performance on SPP Indicators as well as other factors, such as number of referrals and referral sources, age at referral, Medicaid eligibility, exit reasons, etc. Reports are generated prior to onsite visits for data verification purposes and ad hoc reports are produced as needed throughout the year to inform decisions about focused monitoring activities and technical assistance. Data collected through the data system are also used to inform follow-up activities for informal complaints and in the dispute resolution process. Expenditure data is provided to the CCBs monthly to provide a tool for fiscal tracking. In addition, data regarding the average number of children served, by CCB, each month informs the annual fiscal allocation for state and federal funds.

Data for reporting child outcomes are collected through the EI Colorado Provider Database and the data for reporting family outcomes are collected through the annual Family Outcomes Survey.

### Focused Monitoring

Focused monitoring may occur when there are patterns of statewide issues related to noncompliance, poor statewide or local performance on specific priority areas or if the CDHS has a need to investigate a complaint. Focused monitoring occurs to determine the specific reasons for the noncompliance. Investigation in this manner allows the CDHS to tailor technical assistance to meet the specific needs of local programs as well as accelerate the process for timely correction of noncompliance.

A priority area is determined by the CDHS annually depending on the results of APR data, new procedures being implemented or specific concerns raised by stakeholders or EI program staff. If there are no concerns about specific programs, the monitoring schedule is chosen to represent a cross-section of programs based on size, region of the state and program structure.

A focused monitoring visit typically lasts one to two days and may include interviews with administrators, staff, parents and community partners, as well as a review of child records, policies and procedures and other pertinent documents.

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

As a result of the focused monitoring, technical assistance is provided and the results of the monitoring are reviewed to:

- A. Determine if a finding of noncompliance should be issued to a CCB;
- B. Verify whether data demonstrate noncompliance, and then issue a finding if data demonstrate noncompliance; or,
- C. Verify that the CCB has corrected any noncompliance identified during the monitoring, in which case a finding of noncompliance would not be issued.

A Plan of Correction (POC) may be developed following the monitoring if warranted. The POC has prescribed actions that must occur within specified timelines. A CCB receives a written monitoring report that includes the POC, if applicable. Specific data reporting requirements, including frequency of data submissions, are outlined in the POC and data is required to be submitted until 100% compliance is reached and verified. A follow-up onsite visit may be conducted if needed to review more current data and verify correction.

If after six months a CCB has not corrected noncompliance, additional data reporting and technical assistance may be initiated. Once 100% compliance is reached and verified, the CCB is sent a letter releasing it from the finding of noncompliance and closing the POC.

### Fiscal Management

The CDHS has statutory authority to ensure financial accountability and service provision. EI program staff ensures that federal Part C Funds are obligated and liquidated within the allowable timeframe and for appropriate activities.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the implementation of a comprehensive EI system in Colorado is developed and annually reviewed by the Colorado Departments of Human Services, Education, Public Health and Environment, Health Care Policy and Financing and the Division of Insurance. The MOU articulates the interagency commitment, as well as statutory and regulatory authority for the implementation of a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system of EI services and assigns fiscal responsibility for specific aspects of the EI program.

EI program staff works with the CICC and the MOU Committee to promote interagency funding of EI services that meets federal and state requirements and ensures that eligible infants and toddlers and their families benefit from a comprehensive, coordinated EI system. The EI program staff prepares the annual application and budget for the OSEP and ensures proper accounting of funds expended under the federal Part C grant. The EI program staff also prepares an annual budget for the distribution of the state General Fund for EI services and service coordination.

The CDHS has annual contracts in place with the 20 CCBs, as the local EI program administrators, that allocate funds based on a funding formula that takes into account the known and projected demand statewide. Funds are awarded equitably to each CCB in order to ensure that funds are available in all areas of the state, which include rural, urban, and suburban areas.

In addition to state fiscal rules, the *Fiscal Management and Accountability Procedures* document is provided to the CCBs and posted on the website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org) to provide guidance for funding utilization. The *Fiscal Management and Accountability Procedures* is reviewed annually and revised as needed to ensure the most current information is available to guide state and local fiscal accountability.

CCBs are required to have an audit of annual financial statements to ensure that they are billing appropriately for services rendered and following the funding hierarchy. In addition, the CCBs submit a Year-End Revenue and Expenditure Report that captures fiscal data for funding sources that are not tracked through the EI program data system.

EI program staff conducts monthly utilization reviews to monitor expenditures for direct services to ensure that the funding hierarchy is being followed and that Federal Part C Funds are used as payor of last resort. Fiscal monitoring is conducted with selected CCBs to ensure that programs have appropriate financial procedures in place and reviews both program and child level requirements for fiscal accountability. The selection of the programs to be monitored is based on revenue and expenditure reports, financial audits, desk audits and performance on other SPP indicators. CCBs receiving a focused monitoring also have a review of records conducted to ensure that the funding hierarchy is being followed and allowable services are being provided and paid for in accordance with state and federal policies and procedures. If noncompliance is identified, the procedures for issuing findings and a POC, as described in the Focused Monitoring section, are followed.

### Dispute Resolution

An array of dispute resolution options is available for families including complaint procedures, mediation and due process hearing procedures. The *EI Colorado State Plan* describes the policies and procedures that are followed during dispute resolution pursuant to 12 CCR 2509-10, Section 7.990-994.

The EI program Procedural Safeguards Officer provides training for CCBs on dispute resolution and instruction for surrogate parents and hearing and mediation officers.

Annually, EI program staff conducts a review of dispute resolution activities to determine any trends that require a system change or other improvement activities. These trends are reported to the CICC for recommendations regarding follow-up strategies.

### Training and Technical Assistance

Statewide training is conducted and technical assistance documents are distributed in order to clarify and ensure effective implementation of the requirements under IDEA Part C and State EI rules, policies and procedures. The ultimate goal of all training and technical assistance activities is to ensure accountability and promote recommended and evidence-based practices in meeting the needs of infants and toddlers who have developmental delays or disabilities and their families.

EI program staff collaborates with the Colorado Early Childhood Professional Development Advisory Committee (ECPD) Committee to guide the state's training and technical assistance system. This group is made up of representatives from: Higher education and teacher licensing; the Colorado Department of Education; early childhood professionals; early intervention; preschool special education; state child care licensing; Head Start; early childhood training, coaching and quality improvement providers; and, family, friend and neighbor child care,

EI program staff, the CICC and the ECPD Committee review the annual *Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Plan* to ensure that training needs are being met through statewide initiatives and interagency collaborative efforts and, if necessary, revise the *Early Intervention Personnel Standards*.

All service coordinators and local EI program administrators are required to attend the statewide Service Coordination Core Training and IFSP Training. Families, providers and interagency partners are also encouraged to attend.

Conference calls or webinars are provided to local programs each month to accompany the launch of new policies and procedures or provide technical assistance based on identified needs. A statewide meeting for EI Coordinators occurs annually to address new requirements and provide concentrated technical assistance. EI program staff produces Communication Briefs and other technical assistance documents to address aspects of the EI process, ensure statewide consistency, and promote effective and evidence-based EI practices. Current technical assistance documents are posted on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org).

Training and technical assistance are generally provided by EI program staff members. When appropriate, the CDHS may contract with university programs, parent organizations and private consultants to provide training and technical assistance to CCBs, providers and families. Training and technical assistance staff and contractors review data, survey results and monitoring reports to inform the content of the training materials and identification of specific programs

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
that need assistance.

Evaluations are distributed after any training is conducted and information gathered is used to inform any adjustments to the training format or curriculum as well as needs for additional training. Self-assessment practices are used to enable local programs to monitor their performance and proactively identify training and technical assistance needs in a timely fashion.

Attachments				
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
	<a href="#">cicc form.pdf</a>	Kate Moran, PhD	4/5/2018 11:41 AM	

**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 early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Timely, high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support is provided to local EI programs through ongoing written and audio-visual resources and support to professionals and families regarding the implementation of the IFSP and recommended EI services, as well as appropriate and consistent use of the funding hierarchy. This ensures that professionals and families have access to policies, information, current research and recommended practices, and that families have access to technical assistance materials designed specifically for family use in English and Spanish.

EI program staff, the CICC and the ECPD Committee review the annual *Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Plan* to ensure that technical assistance needs are being met through statewide initiatives and interagency collaborative efforts.

The CDHS contracts with university programs, parent organizations and private consultants to provide training and technical assistance to CCBs, providers and families.

EI program staff provides individualized, targeted technical assistance site visits as needed, and ongoing TA occurs via phone and email. Technical assistance conference calls are provided each month to accompany the launch of new policies and procedures.

EI program staff participates in ongoing national technical assistance activities and community of practice work in order to inform the technical assistance that is provided to local programs.

Self-assessment practices are used to enable local programs to monitor their performance and to proactively identify training and technical assistance needs in a timely fashion.

Training and technical assistance staff and contractors review data and monitoring reports to inform the content of the technical assistance materials and identification of specific programs that need assistance.

EI program staff produces technical assistance documents to address aspects of the EI process and to promote effective and evidence-based EI practices. Current technical assistance documents are posted on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org).

Technical assistance is generally provided by EI program staff members. When appropriate, the CDHS may contract with university programs, parent organizations or private consultants to provide technical assistance to CCBs, providers and families.

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

**Professional Development System:**

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The long term objectives of the Colorado Comprehensive System of Personnel Development are that: Services are provided within family-driven constructs and based on the concerns and priorities of the family; families have increased confidence and competence in supporting the development of their child; infants and toddlers are supported in accessing developmental learning opportunities within their family and community routines and activities; and children successfully transition to appropriate supports and services at or before three years of age.

EI program staff collaborates with the ECPD Committee to guide the state's training and technical assistance system for professional development.

The professional development system has three approaches:

**Pre-service Training** - Provides course content needed for students to implement best practice in EI service provision for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. This ensures students have competencies needed for working in Colorado's EI system. The avenues for implementation include state community colleges; public and private universities and colleges; web-based training and technical assistance materials; collaboration between the EI program and higher education; and parents as co-teachers.

The EI program staff collaborates with higher education faculty through participation in federally-funded projects to advise curriculum development, assist in the coordination of practicum sites, and provide guest presentations.

**In-service Training** - Provides orientation to the EI system, core training sessions on service coordination competencies and IFSP development and access to training curriculum across the state. This ensures that professionals have the knowledge, skills and abilities to implement federal and state EI policies and procedures and implement evidence-based recommended practices for working with infants and toddlers and their families. The avenues for implementation are through mandatory state-sponsored training, statewide and community-based training opportunities, community-specific training and workshops, web-based training, targeted technical assistance and technical assistance materials.

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

Additional in-service training includes training for EI program administrators, data managers and billing staff. This ensures that program staff has the knowledge and skills to ensure federal and state compliance with program requirements and ensure timely, valid and reliable data submission for state monitoring and reporting.

**Technical Assistance** - Provides ongoing resources and support to professionals and families regarding implementing the IFSP and recommended EI services. This ensures that professionals and families have access to policies, information, current research and recommended practices, and that families have access to technical assistance materials designed specifically for family use.

State leadership implements several approaches to state-level guidance for the development and implementation of personnel development and other opportunities for professionals working in the EI system:

- A. The State Policy Team for the Pyramid and Inclusive Practices is a cross-agency team supporting the Colorado Center for Social Emotional Competence and Inclusion, promoting the social emotional development of all children, birth through five, through a collaborative professional development system that fosters and sustains the statewide, high-fidelity use of the Pyramid Plus Approach, and other related evidence-based practices integrated with relevant Colorado efforts.
- B. The Co-TOP\*EIS Project is a training to prepare paraprofessionals for their roles in the delivery of EI services, and to train EI professionals to effectively train and supervise paraprofessionals. The in-service curriculum is being adopted by and infused into Community College Early Childhood coursework.
- C. Service Coordination On-line Orientation Modules are required training for new service coordinators to provide the basic information needed to begin their work within the EI system. Included are content relevant to service coordination and service provision, links to pertinent documents, learning activities, and a topical discussion forum for course participants. The modules are also made available on the EI Colorado website for other professionals, family members, and higher education students.
- D. Early Intervention Colorado Service Coordination Core Training is required face-to-face training for all local EI program directors and service coordinators. Community members and referral sources wanting to gain a more comprehensive knowledge of Colorado's system of early intervention supports and services also participate. Topics covered include:
  - 1. Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;
  - 2. Roles and responsibilities of service coordinators;
  - 3. Procedural safeguards;
  - 4. The Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP) Process: First Steps through Transition;
  - 5. Colorado's EI system; and,
    - 6. Communication, teaming and building relationships.
- E. Early Intervention Colorado IFSP Training is required for all EI program directors and service coordinators. Other participants include early childhood evaluation and assessment team members, EI providers, Local Interagency Coordinating Council (LICC) members, and community partners. Topics covered are:
  - 1. Learning about the child and family;
  - 2. Family assessment
  - 3. Developing the Plan of Action; and,
  - 4. Early intervention supports and services.
- F. Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Training builds the capacity of local Community Centered Boards (CCBs) to provide training for providers who are involved in the child outcomes ratings process. EI Colorado provides training and technical assistance documents for use in the COS process including how to utilize age-anchoring, decision tree, and other resources for completing an entry and exit rating in all three child outcome areas.
- G. Additional technical assistance methods are used to provide resources and support to the EI system that include the following:
  - 1. Technical Assistance documents;
  - 2. Web-based training modules;
  - 3. Technical assistance webinars; and,
  - 4. Individualized technical assistance from state and contract staff, including support for primary referral sources via email, phone, and site visits.

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

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part C results indicators

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

The CDHS EI program began the process of soliciting stakeholder input on the SPP targets and development and implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) in May 2013. Stakeholders involved in the process are:

- A. CDHS OEC staff, including Race to the Top;
- B. CICC;
- C. CCB staff;
- D. Early Childhood Councils and LICC;
- E. Families;
- F. EI direct service providers;

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

- G. Higher Education partners;
- H. Colorado Department of Education (CDE);
- I. Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (CDHCPF);
- J. Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE);
- K. PEAK Parent Center;
- L. Higher education students;
- M. Other early childhood professionals; and,
- N. Community advocates.

Stakeholder input has been critical to the development of the SPP/SSIP. Feedback was acquired during the following dates/activities:

- A. May 15, 2013 – Annual Statewide CCB EI Coordinators Meeting;
- B. June 5, 2013 – CICC quarterly meeting;
- C. September 27, 2013 – Annual CICC Planning Meeting;
- D. November 20, 2013 – CICC quarterly meeting;
- E. December 9, 2013 – OEC Leadership Meeting;
- F. May 15, 2014 – Annual Statewide CCB EI Coordinators Meeting;
- G. August 22, 2014 – CDE meeting to align the State Improvement Measurable Result (SIMR) with that proposed for Part B;
- H. September 3, 2014 – Broad stakeholder meeting with OSEP staff;
- I. November 6, 2014 – CICC quarterly meeting; and,
- J. February 21, 2015 – CICC quarterly meeting.

The EI Communication Plan that guides the information flow includes the following:

- A. The Circles of Involvement\* document that identifies audiences (e.g., professional groups, families and parent groups, referral sources, collaborating agencies, funders, legislators, practitioners) who are key to implementation and support of the new practices;
- B. For each activity of the SSIP Implementation Plan, the "messages", materials, and formats appropriate for each audience;
- C. Descriptions of the core features and components of the new practice(s), the evidence base and expected outcomes;
- D. Identification of potential opposition, reasons for opposition and the team response and strategies for addressing challenges;
- E. Instructions to follow departmental clearance procedures as necessary for each type of communication;
- F. Identification of multiple communication strategies to distribute information that include:
  - 1. Communication Briefs;
  - 2. Articles in OEC Newsletter;
  - 3. "What's New" blasts to email lists and posting on website; and,
    - 4. Webinar or face-to-face presentations for CICC, EI Coordinators, and other key stakeholder groups.
- G. Multiple communication strategies and feedback loops to evaluate the impact of the messages; and,
- H. Communication tools for CCBs to use with their local stakeholders and champions to promote the new practice(s).

\* Adapted from "Creating a Framework of Support and Involvement" originally created by the Canadian Institute of Cultural Affairs © 2002-2012

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

Annually, the CDHS conducts a desk audit and measures the compliance and performance of each CCB on the SPP targets and publicly reports this information on an individual *Early Intervention Program Performance Profile*. CDHS reports on the following:

- A. Current data;
- B. Current data performance in relation to state targets and CCBs of similar size using percentage measurements;
- C. Ranking of CCB performance in comparison to other CCBs of similar size; and,
- D. Description of whether the CCB met the target, made progress or slipped.

The CCB *Early Intervention Program Performance Profile* also includes:

- A. The status determination;
  - B. Demographic information about the CCB;
  - C. The geographic area that is covered by the CCB; and,
- 9/11/2018

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

D. Contact information for the CCB.

A statement is provided by the CDHS in the Profile regarding timely correction of noncompliance, timely submission of fiscal audits, completion of local interagency operating agreements and timely submission of valid and reliable data. CCBs are given the opportunity to provide a statement regarding their performance during the previous year and any subsequent improvements.

Data are generated from the following sources:

- A. EI Program data system;
- B. EI Provider Database;
- C. Family Outcomes Survey;
- D. Table 1 Report of Children Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C; and,
- E. Table 2 Report of Program Setting Where Early Intervention Services are Provided to Children with Disabilities and Their Families in Accordance with Part C

The criteria used to establish status determinations are described in the *Local Program Status Determinations Criteria*.

The OSEP requires the CDHS to enforce IDEA by making status determinations annually on the performance of each CCB EI program using the same four categories that the OSEP uses in making the state status determination and consider the following:

- A. Performance on compliance indicators;
- B. Whether data submitted by the CCB EI programs are valid, reliable and timely;
- C. Uncorrected noncompliance; and,
- D. Any audit findings.

In addition, the CDHS also considers:

- A. Performance in meeting indicator targets;
- B. Fiscal audits; and,
- C. Completion of local interagency operating agreements.

The CCB status determination informs the level of technical assistance and/or corrective action that is required for the local program.

The CDHS will report to the public on the performance of each local EI program located in the state on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but not later than 120 days following the submission of its FFY APR as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

The CCB *Early Intervention Program Performance Profiles* are posted on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org), Documents and Reports under the Monitoring Reports, Plans of Correction, Public Performance and Determinations link.

A complete copy of Colorado's SPP, including any revisions, and APR is located on the EI Colorado website at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org), Documents and Reports under the Annual Performance Reports (APR) and State Performance Plan: Federal IDEA, Part C links.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

### OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR.

### Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2017 and 2018 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2018 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 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, 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.



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	82.00%	84.80%	91.46%	94.80%	96.10%	96.50%	97.49%	96.75%	96.14%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	92.16%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
7203	9645	92.16%	100%	90.08%

**Reasons for Slippage**

A review of data for FFY 2016 showed that the primary reason for new early intervention services to be initiated late was due to a shortage of providers, particularly in the metro area. This lack of providers also resulted in less flexibility in the ability to meet during a family's preferred time or day of availability, leading to additional services beginning late.

To address the 9.92% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2016 for Indicator 1, the CDHS issued six findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017 based on FFY 2016 data.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	1,485
--	-------

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Colorado defines "timely" as 28 days and calculates timeliness by the time period elapsed between the date the parent consents to IFSP.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Selection from the full reporting period, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Colorado collects data from all EI programs in the statewide web-based data system and reports for 100% of the children for whom new services were listed on an initial IFSP and/or subsequent six month, annual or other periodic review for the full reporting period.

Data analysis includes the number of infants and toddlers from all of the 20 Community Centered Board (CCB) Early 9/11/2018

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

Intervention programs who had an initial IFSP and/or subsequent six month, annual or other periodic reviews.

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

To address the 7.84% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 1, the CDHS issued four findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State's FFY 2015 data for this indicator reflected less than 100% compliance. The State explained that to address the 7.84% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 1, the CDHS issued four findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR. The State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			90.00%	90.50%	90.50%	93.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data		95.00%	96.39%	94.84%	98.84%	99.50%	99.70%	99.76%	99.78%	99.84%	99.87%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	95.00%
Data	99.89%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets for Indicator 2 were selected with broad stakeholder input. Feedback was solicited from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC), Community Centered Boards (CCBs), early intervention (EI) providers, a broad stakeholder group and families through in-person presentations, email correspondence and information posted on the EI Colorado Provider Database and the EI Colorado website.

Constituents represented included:

- A. Parents from urban and rural areas of the state;
- B. Head Start;
- C. Child Find;
- D. EI service providers;
- E. Home health agencies;
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  - 1. Health Care Policy and Financing
  - 2. Department of Education
  - 3. Public Health and Environment
  - 4. Human Services, Children's Habilitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education;
- L. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center;
- M. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- N. Peak Parent Center; and,
- O. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	5,984	

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	6,006	

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5,984	6,006	99.89%	95.00%	99.63%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? **No**

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2013	Target ≥						68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	71.00%	71.00%
		Data					20.28%	69.40%	74.36%	69.60%	72.04%	70.61%	67.42%
A2	2013	Target ≥						75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	67.00%	67.00%
		Data					84.48%	74.70%	73.16%	73.20%	66.76%	67.80%	67.45%
B1	2013	Target ≥						62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	76.00%	76.00%
		Data					25.23%	62.40%	67.38%	74.50%	79.14%	75.53%	73.49%
B2	2013	Target ≥						67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	53.00%	53.00%
		Data					84.82%	66.00%	64.03%	59.20%	48.66%	49.32%	49.23%
C1	2013	Target ≥						64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	76.00%	76.00%
		Data					44.91%	65.40%	70.57%	75.40%	77.18%	74.85%	76.29%
C2	2013	Target ≥						78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	67.00%	67.00%
		Data					87.86%	77.40%	76.49%	73.30%	67.81%	66.65%	67.98%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	71.00%
	Data	66.46%
A2	Target ≥	67.00%
	Data	67.28%
B1	Target ≥	76.00%
	Data	72.39%
B2	Target ≥	53.00%
	Data	50.76%
C1	Target ≥	76.00%
	Data	73.14%
C2	Target ≥	67.00%
	Data	65.10%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	71.00%	71.00%	72.00%
Target A2 ≥	67.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B1 ≥	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%
Target B2 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target C1 ≥	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%
Target C2 ≥	67.00%	67.00%	68.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets for Indicator 3 were selected with broad stakeholder input. Feedback was solicited from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC), Community Centered Boards (CCBs), early intervention (EI) providers, a broad stakeholder group and families through in-person presentations, email correspondence and information posted on the EI Colorado Provider Database and the EI Colorado website.

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

Constituents represented included:

- A. Parents from urban and rural areas of the state;
- B. Head Start;
- C. Child Find;
- D. EI service providers;
- E. Home health agencies;
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  - 1. Health Care Policy and Financing
  - 2. Department of Education
  - 3. Public Health and Environment
  - 4. Human Services, Children's Habilitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education;
- L. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center;
- M. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- N. Peak Parent Center; and,
- O. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	1880.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	25.00	1.33%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	366.00	19.47%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	208.00	11.06%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	530.00	28.19%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	751.00	39.95%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	738.00	1129.00	66.46%	71.00%	65.37%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1281.00	1880.00	67.28%	67.00%	68.14%

**Reasons for A1 Slippage**

The CDHS regularly analyzes data for this indicator and continues to determine that results illustrate that performance on this Indicator is related to the specific cohort of children entering and exiting EI. The quality improvement activities being implemented focus on the integration of individual IFSP activities with the three global outcomes which would lead to an increase in performance on this Indicator.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21.00	1.12%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	416.00	22.13%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	474.00	25.21%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	715.00	38.03%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	254.00	13.51%

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1189.00	1626.00	72.39%	76.00%	73.12%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	969.00	1880.00	50.76%	53.00%	51.54%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	23.00	1.22%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	355.00	18.88%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	320.00	17.02%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	703.00	37.39%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	479.00	25.48%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	1023.00	1401.00	73.14%	76.00%	73.02%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1182.00	1880.00	65.10%	67.00%	62.87%

**Reasons for C2 Slippage**

The CDHS regularly analyzes data for this indicator and continues to determine that results illustrate that performance on this Indicator is related to the specific cohort of children entering and exiting EI. The quality improvement activities being implemented focus on the integration of individual IFSP activities with the three global outcomes which would lead to an increase in performance on this Indicator.

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program**

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	

*Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.*

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** Yes

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

Colorado is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), and 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.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

States must report the following data starting with the FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 2019: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

--



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4: Family Involvement**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥					80.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	94.00%	94.00%
		Data			88.00%	73.00%	81.48%	89.00%	93.00%	95.00%	92.36%	94.00%	92.21%
B	2009	Target ≥					87.25%	87.50%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	94.00%	94.00%
		Data			94.00%	87.00%	86.48%	92.20%	94.00%	95.00%	94.15%	94.97%	93.02%
C	2009	Target ≥					80.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	94.00%	94.00%
		Data			96.00%	91.00%	90.79%	94.00%	95.00%	94.00%	95.03%	96.04%	95.95%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	94.00%
	Data	91.26%
B	Target ≥	94.00%
	Data	94.25%
C	Target ≥	94.00%
	Data	96.09%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	94.00%	94.00%	97.00%
Target B ≥	94.00%	94.00%	97.00%
Target C ≥	94.00%	94.00%	97.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets for Indicator 4 were selected with broad stakeholder input. Feedback was solicited from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC), Community Centered Boards (CCBs), early intervention (EI) providers, a broad stakeholder group and families through in-person presentations, email correspondence and information posted on the EI Colorado Provider Database and the EI Colorado website.

Constituents represented included:

- A. Parents from urban and rural areas of the state;
- B. Head Start;
- C. Child Find;
- D. EI service providers;
- E. Home health agencies;
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  1. Health Care Policy and Financing
  2. Department of Education
  3. Public Health and Environment
  4. Human Services, Children's Habilitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education;
- L. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center;

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

- M. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- N. Peak Parent Center; and,
- O. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed		7435.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	13.77%	1024.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		921.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights		1012.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs		957.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs		1015.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn		972.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn		1015.00

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	91.26%	94.00%	91.01%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	94.25%	94.00%	94.29%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	96.09%	94.00%	95.76%

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? No

**Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

Data was obtained through distribution of the *EI Colorado Family Outcome Survey*, which was mailed to every family statewide whose child had an active IFSP and was receiving EI services for at least six months as of March 31, 2017. The instrument is a self-report survey completed by one or more family members based on a seven point scale. Families are given the option to respond through a paper survey, online or through a phone call with an interpreter. A response of five or greater is considered a positive response. The full report can be found at [www.eicolorado.org](http://www.eicolorado.org).

During FY 2016 – 17, the Early Intervention Colorado Family Outcomes Survey was distributed to all families served with an active Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) who had been receiving early intervention services for at least six months as of March 2017 (n=7,433). The total statewide number of returned surveys is 1,024 or a 13.77% response rate. This is an increase of 2.51% compared to FY 2015-2016. In addition, 5.91% of distributed surveys were returned as "Not Deliverable" due to inaccurate addresses listed in the EI Data System. The data represent the demographics of the State for the families who received the surveys in the following ways:

**Table 1: Representativeness by Gender of the Child**

Gender of Child	Total Survey Responses	% of Total Child Count Part C	Percentage of Survey Distributed**	Percentage of Survey Responses**
Female	368	36.58%	37.70%	36.23%
Male	656	63.42%	62.30%	64.94%
Total Responses	1024	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Table 2: Representativeness by Family Race and Ethnicity**

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

Family Race and Ethnicity	Total Survey Responses*	% of Total Child Count Part C	Percentage of Survey Distributed**	Percentage of Survey Responses**
None Listed	0	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	0.51%	0.40%	0.29%
Asian	30	3.17%	3.04%	2.93%
Black or African American	14	4.34%	3.61%	1.37%
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.27%	0.24%	0.10%
Hispanic or Latino Origin	155	27.54%	27.77%	15.14%
Two or More Races	26	2.64%	2.50%	2.54%
White	799	61.54%	62.22%	78.03%
Total Responses	1024	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Table 3: Representativeness by Program Size**

Program Size*	Total Survey Responses**	Percentage of Survey Responses***	Percentage of Surveys Distributed****
Extra Small Programs	9	0.88%	0.75%
Small Programs	80	7.81%	6.23%
Medium Programs	245	23.93%	24.50%

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

Large Programs	690	67.38%	68.52%
<b>Total Responses</b>	1024	100.00%	100.00%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.80%	0.90%	0.95%	1.00%	1.05%	1.05%	1.05%	1.05%	1.05%
Data		0.74%	0.73%	0.71%	0.89%	0.95%	0.96%	0.91%	1.00%	1.09%	1.06%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	1.05%
Data	0.84%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.05%	1.05%	1.10%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets for Indicator 5 were selected with broad stakeholder input. Feedback was solicited from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC), Community Centered Boards (CCBs), early intervention (EI) providers, a broad stakeholder group and families through in-person presentations, email correspondence and information posted on the EI Colorado Provider Database and the EI Colorado website.

Constituents represented included:

- A. Parents from urban and rural areas of the state;
- B. Head Start;
- C. Child Find;
- D. EI service providers;
- E. Home health agencies;
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  - 1. Health Care Policy and Financing
  - 2. Department of Education
  - 3. Public Health and Environment
  - 4. Human Services, Children's Habilitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education;
- L. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center;
- M. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- N. Peak Parent Center; and,
- O. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	487	633

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	67,691	67,691
TBD			null	

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

Pre-population data error as reported by *Gregory R. Corr, Ed.D. January 25, 2018*

The data reported to EMAPS for child count reported on October 1, 2016 was accurate based on data sources at that time. During FFY16-17 SPP/APR submission, additional data sources have been used to generate an updated child count (updated in EMAPS) and subsequently an updated number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs is reported for the FFY16-17 SPP/APR.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
633	67,691	0.84%	1.05%	0.94%

**Compare your results to the national data**

Colorado's performance of 0.94% is above the Colorado FFY2015 average of 0.84% and slightly under the average of 1.24% for the 50 states, D.C. and Puerto Rico.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.00%	2.20%	2.30%	2.40%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	3.00%	3.00%
Data		1.85%	1.92%	1.92%	2.17%	2.35%	2.65%	2.88%	3.00%	3.06%	3.40%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	3.00%
Data	3.14%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	3.00%	3.00%	3.20%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets for Indicator 6 were selected with broad stakeholder input. Feedback was solicited from the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC), Community Centered Boards (CCBs), early intervention (EI) providers, a broad stakeholder group and families through in-person presentations, email correspondence and information posted on the EI Colorado Provider Database and the EI Colorado website.

Constituents represented included:

- A. Parents from urban and rural areas of the state;
- B. Head Start;
- C. Child Find;
- D. EI service providers;
- E. Home health agencies;
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  - 1. Health Care Policy and Financing
  - 2. Department of Education
  - 3. Public Health and Environment
  - 4. Human Services, Children's Habilitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education;
- L. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center;
- M. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- N. Peak Parent Center; and,
- O. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	6,006	6762

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

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	202,608	202608
TBD			null	

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

Pre-population data error as reported by *Gregory R. Corr, Ed.D. January 25, 2018*

The data reported to EMAPS for child count reported on October 1, 2016 was accurate based on data sources at that time. During FFY16-17 SPP/APR submission, additional data sources have been used to generate an updated child count (updated in EMAPS) and subsequently an updated number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs is reported for the FFY16-17 SPP/APR.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
6,762	202,608	3.14%	3.00%	3.34%

**Compare your results to the national data**

Colorado's performance of 3.34% is above the Colorado target of 3.00% and above the average of 3.12% for the 50 states, D.C. and Puerto Rico.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		78.60%	90.00%	90.59%	96.71%	97.20%	98.30%	99.10%	98.94%	96.84%	95.83%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	85.75%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5,084	8,125	85.75%	100%	87.78%
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>				2,048

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

- State monitoring
- State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Data were selected from the full reporting period, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

The data on the number of infants and toddlers from all 20 of the CCBs who received timely evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were captured in the statewide data analysis of all eligible children who were referred between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. Timeliness was calculated by comparing the days between the date the referral was received by the Part C system with the date the initial IFSP meeting was conducted when required. Any time period lapse of 45 days or less was documented as timely.

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

During the review of FFY 2016 data, it was identified that the largest reasons for untimely multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting are a result of (46%) a required participant not being available and late multidisciplinary evaluation (37%).

Under Colorado statute, birth through two evaluation activities are conducted by Child Find teams at the local Administrative Unit (AU) or Board of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES). These are administered under the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). This bifurcated system means that birth through two evaluations are administered under a separate Department from CDHS, which oversees the rest of EI activities. Child Find teams are over capacity and not able to conduct all evaluations for Part C referrals. While there are safeguards in place to allow CCBs to conduct evaluations, it is not always possible to find appropriate EI providers who are available to conduct the evaluations in a timely manner, since they must work around their caseloads. The CDHS and CDE are working 9/11/2018

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

collaboratively together to find solutions to the current issues, with the ultimate goal of having all Part C activities, including birth through two evaluations, overseen by the CDHS.

To address the 12.22% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2016 for Indicator 7, the CDHS has issued findings to seven CCB EI programs in FFY 2017 for this indicator based on FFY 2016 year-end data.

To address the 14.25% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 7, the CDHS issued seven findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State's FFY 2015 data for this indicator reflected less than 100% compliance. The State explained that to address the 14.25% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 7, the CDHS issued seven findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR. The State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.



(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		89.00%	96.55%	99.09%	99.70%	99.70%	99.90%	100%	99.17%	98.09%	98.32%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	92.91%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,215	3,811	92.91%	100%	97.17%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	488
--	-----

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were selected from the full reporting period, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

The data on the number of toddlers from all 20 of the CCBs who received timely transition planning were captured in the statewide data analysis of all children who turned two years and nine months between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. Colorado collects data from all EI programs in a statewide data system and reports on 100% of the children who turned two years and nine months during FFY 2016.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To address the 2.83% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2016 for Indicator 8A, the CDHS has issued two findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017 for Indicator 8A FFY 2016 year-end data.

To address the 8.42% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 8A, the CDHS issued two findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State's FFY 2015 data for this indicator reflected less than 100% compliance. The State explained that to address the 8.42% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 8A, the CDHS issued two findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR. The State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	98.00%	98.22%	99.17%	99.90%	100%	100%	98.90%	99.45%	99.74%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.83%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,496	3,774	97.83%	100%	97.35%

<p><b>Number of parents who opted out</b> This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</p>	183
---	-----

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

The data on the number of toddlers from all 20 of the CCBs who received timely transition planning were captured in the statewide data analysis of all children with an active IFSP who turned two years and nine months between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. Colorado collects data from all EI programs in a statewide data system and reports on 100% of the children with an active IFSP who turned two years and nine months during FFY 2016.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes**

**Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes**

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

State monitoring  
9/11/2018

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were selected from the full reporting period, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The data on the number of toddlers from all 20 of the CCBs who received timely transition planning were captured in the statewide data analysis of all children who turned two years and nine months between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. Colorado collects data from all EI programs in a statewide data system and reports on 100% of the children who turned two years and nine months during FFY 2016.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To address the 2.17% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2016 for Indicator 8B, the CDHS has issued one finding of noncompliance in FFY 2017 for Indicator 8B FFY 2016 year-end data.

To address the 2.17% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 8B, the CDHS issued four findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR.

## Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

## OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2015 data for this indicator reflected less than 100% compliance. The State explained that to address the 2.17% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2015 for Indicator 8B, the CDHS issued four findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2015 year-end data review. Written notice of noncompliance occurred within FFY 2016, therefore, correction of this noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2017 APR. The State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 from FFY 2015 data 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

## Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		89.00%	83.06%	84.74%	93.73%	97.00%	97.90%	98.64%	96.67%	96.52%	96.92%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.36%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,630	3,774	98.36%	100%	93.50%

<b>Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference</b> <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	52
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	850

**Reasons for Slippage**

A review of data for FFY 2016 showed that the primary reason is due to service coordinator issues. AU/CCB reschedule and required participant not available (29%).

To address the 6.5% noncompliance that occurred in FFY 2016 for Indicator 8C, the CDHS has issued six CCB EI programs findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017 for Indicator 8C FFY 2016 year-end data.

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

- State monitoring

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were selected from the full reporting period, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The data on the number of toddlers from all 20 of the CCBs who received timely transition planning were captured in the statewide data analysis of all children who turned two years and nine months between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. Colorado collects data from all EI programs in a statewide data system and reports on 100% of the children who turned two years and nine months during FFY 2016.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To address the 1.64% noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, the CDHS provided additional technical assistance statewide with an emphasis on the metro area. Each CCB with data reflecting less than 100% compliance identified and corrected identified issues leading to noncompliance pre-finding; therefore no findings of noncompliance were reported for FFY 2015. CDHS verified that each CCB (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											NA

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Part B due process procedures are not adopted for Colorado Part C.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

This Indicator is not applicable to the State.

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Colorado has not reached the OSEP minimum of 10 mediations per year. No mediations were filed during FFY 2016.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

--

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		76.00%	76.00%	76.00%
Data	74.85%	76.29%	73.14%	73.02%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	76.00%	77.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

**Overview**

**Data Analysis**

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

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

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

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

### Statement

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

### Description

## Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

## Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

See attached Colorado 2013-2018 SPP Indicator 11 - SSIP

## Infrastructure Development

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

See attached Colorado SSIP Phase II

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

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

See attached Colorado SSIP Phase II

## Evaluation

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

See attached Colorado SSIP Phase II

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

## Technical Assistance and Support

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

See attached Colorado SSIP Phase II

## Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

## A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See attached Colorado FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan Indicator 11 State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Submitted March 30, 2018.

## B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See attached Colorado FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan Indicator 11 State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Submitted March 30, 2018.

## C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See attached Colorado FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan Indicator 11 State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Submitted March 30, 2018.

## D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See attached Colorado FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan Indicator 11 State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Submitted March 30, 2018.

## E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

See attached Colorado FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan Indicator 11 State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Submitted March 30, 2018.

## F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See attached Colorado FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan Indicator 11 State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Submitted March 30, 2018.

## OSEP Response

Required Actions



**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

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

Name: Christy Scott

Title: Early Intervention Program Director

Email: christy.scott@state.co.us

Phone: 303-866-2664