

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part C**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18**

**Colorado**



**PART C DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

Colorado accessed technical assistance in FFY in 2018-19:

- Participation in the National Service Coordinator Training Workgroup and the subgroup on the SC Leadership both supported by DEC and ECPC. This resulted in the development of the Recommended Knowledge and Skills for Service Coordinators document
- Participation in the DEC Early Intervention/Early Childhood Professional Development Community of Practice but I turned that over to Aimee when she was here. I know both Wayla and Beth have joined these calls in the past too.
- Participation in the CADRE group with ECTA (Part C Learning Community)
- Participation in the Part C Data Manager Calls that are set up by ECTA
- Participation in monthly OSEP TA calls
- Participation in multiple webinars put on by national TA Centers

#### 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.**

Rules, Policies and Procedures: 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.

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).

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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

#### **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.

#### **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.

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.

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.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

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;
- 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.

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

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

NO

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program 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 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, 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,
- 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 Portal;
- 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

[http://coloradoofficeofearlychildhood.force.com/eicolorado/EI\\_Reports?p=Reports&s=Public-Reports-and-Data&lang=en](http://coloradoofficeofearlychildhood.force.com/eicolorado/EI_Reports?p=Reports&s=Public-Reports-and-Data&lang=en).

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.

## **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 18, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Four of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator C-11, by April 1, 2020. Although the State submitted a SSIP report, the State did not provide FFY 2018 data for the indicator. Because the State did not provide data, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. In addition, the State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

The State did not provide data for FFY 2018 Indicator C-11. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must provide a FFY 2019 target and report FFY 2019 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 in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including 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; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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.

**Intro - State Attachments**

The State did not submit 508 compliant attachments. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.

## Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the 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).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	87.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.75%	96.14%	92.16%	90.08%	90.32%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
9,686	13,268	90.32%	100%	89.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

*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.*

2,221

**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 service and the actual start date of the service.

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

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, 7/1/2018 through 6/30/2019

**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 year.

Data analysis includes the number of infants and toddlers from all of the 20 Community Center Board (CCB) Early Intervention programs who had an initial and/or subsequent six month, annual or other periodic reviews.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

Reasons for delays not related to an exceptional family circumstance included:

- Shortage of available service providers
- The first date of service was scheduled and the service provider cancelled or rescheduled the visit
- Interpreter was not available

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6		0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The CDHS verified that each of the six CCB EI programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 is correctly implementing 34 CFR 303.340(c), 303.342(3), and 303.344(f)(1) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected. The CDHS verified 100% compliance for the six programs through a review of data extracted from the web-based statewide data system.

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

The CDHS verified that the six CCB EI programs had initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program, consistent with "OSEP Memorandum 09-02", dated October 17, 2008. The CDHS verified through a review of data within the EI program web-based data system that all children for whom services were not initiated in a timely manner had their services initiated unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

## **1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	95.00%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	99.84%	99.87%	99.89%	99.63%	99.92%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target>=	96.00%	97.00%

### 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 Center Boards (CCBs), early intervention providers, a broad stakeholder group of families through in-person presentation, email correspondence and information posted on 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
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs;
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  1. Health Care Policy and Finance
  2. Department of Education
  3. Public Health and Environment
  4. Human Services, Children's Habitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education
- L. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- M. Peak Parent Center;
- N. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

### Prepopulated Data

<b>Source</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data</b>
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	8,183
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	8,191

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
8,183	8,191	99.92%	96.00%	99.90%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

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

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

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

If the 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), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

### 3 - Indicator Data

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)? (yes/no)

NO

#### 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 Center Boards (CCBs), early intervention providers, , a broad stakeholder group of families through in-person presentation, email correspondence and information posted on 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
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs;
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  1. Health Care Policy and Finance
  2. Department of Education
  3. Public Health and Environment
  4. Human Services, Children's Habitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education
- L. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- M. Peak Parent Center;
- N. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2013	Target>=	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%
A1	70.61%	Data	70.61%	67.42%	66.46%	65.37%	58.96%
A2	2013	Target>=	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
A2	67.80%	Data	67.80%	67.45%	67.28%	68.14%	68.48%
B1	2013	Target>=	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%
B1	75.53%	Data	75.53%	73.49%	72.39%	73.12%	68.95%
B2	2013	Target>=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
B2	49.32%	Data	49.32%	49.23%	50.76%	51.54%	59.33%
C1	2013	Target>=	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%	76.00%
C1	74.85%	Data	74.85%	76.29%	73.14%	73.02%	69.95%
C2	2013	Target>=	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
C2	66.65%	Data	66.65%	67.98%	65.10%	62.87%	60.30%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	72.00%	72.00%
Target A2>=	68.00%	68.00%
Target B1>=	77.00%	77.00%
Target B2>=	54.00%	54.00%
Target C1>=	77.00%	77.00%
Target C2>=	68.00%	68.00%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

2,494

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Total

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	56	2.25%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	547	21.93%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	203	8.14%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	523	20.97%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,165	46.71%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	726	1,329	58.96%	72.00%	54.63%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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	1,688	2,494	68.48%	68.00%	67.68%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

The percentage of children who leave the Colorado Part C program and do not go on to need Part B preschool special education services is 49%. While the date reported for 2018 shows slippage, the 54.63% correlates closely with the percent of children who do not need to continue on with special education services and accurately reflects the performance for our program. The data reported in Indicator 3A1 cannot be compared to 3B1 and 3C1 as the three indicators represent different cohorts of children.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	47	1.88%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	627	25.14%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	438	17.56%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	814	32.64%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	568	22.77%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,252	1,926	68.95%	77.00%	65.01%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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	1,382	2,494	59.33%	54.00%	55.41%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

The data reported for Indicator B1 for FFY 2018 shows slippage from FFY 2017 and is slightly above the data collected on the number of children who leave the Colorado Part C program and do not go on to need Part B preschool special education services (49%). The cohort represented in Indicator 3B1 does not directly correlate with the cohorts represented in 3A1 and 3C1, therefore the cumulative data represented in the 51% of children potentially needing Part B services seems to accurately represent the population of children leaving the Part C program as a whole.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	40	1.60%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	641	25.70%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	353	14.15%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	931	37.33%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	529	21.21%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,284	1,965	69.95%	77.00%	65.34%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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	1,460	2,494	60.30%	68.00%	58.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

The data reported for Indicator C1 for FFY 2018 shows slippage from FFY 2017 and is slightly above the data collected on the number of children who leave the Colorado Part C program and do not go on to need Part B preschool special education services (49%). The cohort represented in Indicator 3C1 does not directly correlate with the cohorts represented in 3A1 and 3B1, therefore the cumulative data represented in the 51% of children potentially needing Part B services seems to accurately represent the population of children leaving the Part C program as a whole.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

The data reported for Indicator C2 for FFY 2018 shows a slight slippage from the data reported in FFY 2017 (1.76%). This appears to be a data anomaly and the CDHS EI program will continue to analyze data to determine whether any patterns exist that could be impacting this data.

**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	8,191
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.	2,571

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

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

YES

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

The COS is completed as part of the IFSP process at the Initial IFSP meeting and after completion of Transition activities. Information is gather through structure family assessment, for those parents who consent, or family report. The IFSP team uses an age anchoring tool (Larimer Age Anchoring or MEISER-COS) to gather information and align with the appropriate outcome. The IFSP team uses the Decision Tree (Youngren) to determine rating.

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

**3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Although the State's FFY 2018 data represent slippage from the FFY 2017 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2018 target for this indicator, the State did not, as required, provide an explanation of slippage for A1, B1, and C1.

### **3 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

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. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target>=	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
A	89.00%	Data	94.00%	92.21%	91.26%	91.01%	71.05%
B	2009	Target>=	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
B	92.20%	Data	94.97%	93.02%	94.25%	94.29%	81.05%
C	2009	Target>=	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
C	94.00%	Data	96.04%	95.95%	96.09%	95.76%	77.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	97.00%	98.00%
Target B>=	97.00%	96.00%
Target C>=	97.00%	97.00%

### 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 Center Boards (CCBs), early intervention providers, , a broad stakeholder group of families through in-person presentation, email correspondence and information posted on 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
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs;
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  1. Health Care Policy and Finance
  2. Department of Education
  3. Public Health and Environment
  4. Human Services, Children's Habitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education
- L. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- M. Peak Parent Center;
- N. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	3,658
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	656
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	622
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	626
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	632
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	656
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	634
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	656

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	71.05%	97.00%	99.36%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	81.05%	97.00%	96.34%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	77.00%	97.00%	96.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Was sampling used?	NO
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

**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.**

Colorado analysed response data and found an equitable distribution of race and ethnicity compared to state demographics. While the Hispanic population was slightly underrepresented, several strategies are in place to increase the response rate of this population such as: Translating the survey into several languages, including Spanish; having service coordinators distribute the survey directly to the families; and engaging an Hispanic parent support group to contact Spanish-speaking families directly and assist with the survey. Colorado will continue to implement these strategies and consider other options for increasing the number of Hispanic families who complete the survey in the future.

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

**4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **4 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was representative of the population. However, in its narrative, the State reported that the Hispanic population was slightly underrepresented. Therefore, OSEP is unclear whether or not the response group was representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included strategies to address this issue in the future.

#### **4 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	0.74%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	1.05%	1.05%	1.05%	1.05%	1.05%
Data	1.09%	1.06%	0.84%	0.94%	1.11%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.10%	1.25%

### 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 Center Boards (CCBs), early intervention providers, a broad stakeholder group of families through in-person presentation, email correspondence and information posted on 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
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs;
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  1. Health Care Policy and Finance
  2. Department of Education
  3. Public Health and Environment
  4. Human Services, Children's Habitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education
- L. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- M. Peak Parent Center;
- N. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	851
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	66,125

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
851	66,125	1.11%	1.10%	1.29%	Met Target	No Slippage

Compare your results to the national data

Colorado's performance of 1.29% is above the Colorado FFY 2017 average of 1.11% and above the FFY 2018 target of 1.1%. Colorado is slightly above the average of 1.25% for the US and Outlying Areas and performs similar to that of Montana at 1.24%.

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

### **5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **5 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

### **5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

### 6 - Indicator Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	1.85%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Data	3.06%	3.40%	3.14%	3.34%	3.78%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	3.20%	3.50%

#### 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 Center Boards (CCBs), early intervention providers, , a broad stakeholder group of families through in-person presentation, email correspondence and information posted on 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
- F. Physician;
- G. Colorado Commission of Indian Affairs;
- H. Higher education;
- I. Colorado Departments of:
  1. Health Care Policy and Finance
  2. Department of Education
  3. Public Health and Environment
  4. Human Services, Children's Habitation Residential Program (CHRP) Waiver Administrator
- J. Colorado Division of Insurance;
- K. Office of Homeless Education
- L. Early Childhood Mental Health;
- M. Peak Parent Center;
- N. Division of Early Care and Learning (Child Care)

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	8,191
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	200,384

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</b>	<b>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
8,191	200,384	3.78%	3.20%	4.09%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Compare your results to the national data**

Colorado's performance of 4.09% is above the Colorado FFY 2017 average of 3.78% and is above the FFY 2018 target of 3.2%. Colorado performs similarly to Maryland (within .1%) and is above the average of 3.48% for the US and Outlying Areas.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response****6 - Required Actions**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator. However, OSEP cannot accept that target because the State did not indicate that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to provide input on the target for this Indicator.

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

#### Measurement

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) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	78.60%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.84%	95.83%	85.75%	87.78%	88.07%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<b>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</b>	<b>Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
5,133	8,393	88.07%	100%	94.42%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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.

2,792

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

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, 7/1/2018 through 6/30/2019

**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, 2018 and June 30, 2019. 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)**

Reasons for delay not related to exceptional family circumstances included the following:

- The meeting was originally scheduled with the family and a participant representing the evaluation team had to cancel and reschedule
- The evaluation was not conducted early enough to allow sufficient time to schedule the initial IFSP meeting
- The meeting was held but one of the required participants was not present
- No interpreter was available

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7		0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The CDHS verified that each of the seven CCB EI programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 are correctly implementing 34 CFR 303.310(a), 303.321 and 303.342 based on a review of updated data subsequently collected. The CDHS verified 100% compliance for the programs through a review of data for a full population of children for whom a multidisciplinary evaluation and initial IFSP meeting was conducted through the web-based statewide data system.

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

The CDHS verified that each of the seven CCB EI programs had conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program, consistent with "OSEP Memorandum 09-02", dated October 17, 2008. The CDHS verified through a review of data within the EI program data system that all children for whom a multidisciplinary evaluation and initial IFSP meeting were not initiated in a timely manner had these activities conducted unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

## 7 - Required Actions

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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 SEA and the 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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	89.00%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.09%	98.32%	92.91%	97.17%	98.17%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 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)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,370	5,056	98.17%	100%	98.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

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.

610

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

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, 7/1/2018 through 6/30/2019

**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 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, 2018 and June 30, 2019. 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 of age during FFY 2019.

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

Reasons for delay not related to exceptional family circumstances included:

- The IFSP meeting to develop the plan was scheduled and a participant representing the Part C agency had to cancel or reschedule
- The plan was not developed timely due to a service coordinator issue
- No interpreter was available

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2		0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The CDHS verified that each of the two CCB EI program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 is correctly implementing 34 CFR 303.209(d)(2) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected. The CDHS verified 100% compliance for the program through a review of data for a full population of children for whom a transition plan should have been developed through the web-based statewide data system.

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

The CDHS verified that each of the two CCB EI program had conducted the transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition plan was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program, consistent with "OSEP Memorandum 09-02", dated October 17, 2008. The CDHS verified through a review of data within the EI program data system that all children for whom a transition plan was not developed in a timely manner had a transition plan developed unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **8A - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

## **8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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 SEA and the 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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	100.00%
-----------------	------	---------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.45%	99.74%	97.83%	97.35%	95.84%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,434	3,838	95.84%	100%	96.33%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of parents who opted out**

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.

273

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

The data on the number of toddlers from all 20 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, 2018 and June 30, 2019. 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 of age during FFY 2019.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)**

YES

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

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, 7/1/2018 through 6/30/2019

**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 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, 2018 and June 30, 2019. 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 of age during FFY 2019.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The CDHS verified that the CCB EI program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 is correctly implementing 34 CFR 303.209(b)(ii) and (b)(2) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected. The CDHS verified 100% compliance for the program through a review of data for a full population of children for whom an LEA notification should have occurred during through the web-based statewide data system.

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

The CDHS verified that the CCB EI program had notified the LEA and the State, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose notification was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program, consistent with "OSEP Memorandum 09-02", dated October 17, 2008. The CDHS verified through a review of data within the EI program data system that all children for whom an LEA notification was not conducted in a timely manner had an LEA notification initiated unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8B - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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 SEA and the 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)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have 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 their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

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

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	89.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.52%	96.92%	98.36%	93.50%	94.59%



**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 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)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred 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	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,617	3,838	94.59%	100%	96.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

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.

87

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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 not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

999

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

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, 7/1/2018 through 6/30/2019

**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 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, 2018 and June 30, 2019. 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 of age during FFY 2019.

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

Reasons for delay not related to exceptional family circumstances included:

- The transition conference was originally scheduled and someone representing the Part C agency cancelled or rescheduled
- Transition conference was late due to a service coordinator issue
- No interpreter was available

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5		0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The CDHS verified that each of the five CCB EI programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 is correctly implementing 34 CFR 303.209(c)(1) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected. The CDHS verified 100% compliance for the program through a review of data for a full population of children for whom a transition conference should have occurred through the web-based statewide data system.

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

The CDHS verified that each of the five CCB EI programs had conducted the transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program, consistent with "OSEP Memorandum 09-02", dated October 17, 2008. The CDHS verified through a review of data within the EI program data system that all children for whom a transition conference was not conducted in a timely manner had a conference initiated unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the CCB EI program.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8C - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**8C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

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

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

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 9 - Required Actions

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

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

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**10 - Required Actions**

**Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan**



20200428PhaseIISSI  
P18-19COACCESSIBL

## **Overall State APR Attachments**

The State did not submit 508 compliant attachments. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

### **Certify**

I certify that I am the 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.

### **Select the certifier's role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

**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.com

### **Phone:**

303-866-2664

### **Submitted on:**

04/29/20 7:37:07 AM



## ED Attachments



CO-C Dispute  
Resolution 2018-19.



2020 HTDMD Part  
C.pdf



CO-2020datarubric  
partc.pdf



CO  
-resultsmatrix-2020c



CO-aprltr-2020c.pdf