STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on

FFY 2020

Utah

PART B DUE February 1, 2022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

ADA Compliant: November 2022

Introduction

Intro – Instructions

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

Intro – Indicator Data

Intro – Executive Summary

In FFY 2020, Utah met 42 of 51 targets of the applicable Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicators. These included Indicators measuring graduation, drop out, assessments, suspension/expulsion, educational environments, preschool outcomes, parent involvement, disproportionate representation, post-school outcomes, resolution, and mediation sessions (In FFY 2019, Utah met or was in significant compliance with 11 of 26 targets).

Indicator data has been reviewed extensively as the Utah State Board of Education Special Education Services (USBE SES) section has updated baselines and targets to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

The COVID-19 pandemic continued to impact Utah schools. During the 2020-2021 school year, local education agencies (LEAs) determined how they would provide education. In-person learning, virtual learning, or a combination of virtual and in-person learning were provided in each LEA. Some LEAs gave options of in-person or virtual learning, while others provided one method only.

Utah values the findings of this SPP/APR and continues to align efforts and budgets to address those areas most impactful to student outcomes.

Intro – Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Intro – Number of LEAs in your State/Territory during reporting year

156

Intro – General Supervision System:

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

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the USBE Special Education Rules (Rules) state USBE SES staff have the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements (20 U.S.C. § 1400; Rules VIII.C-D). The primary focus is

improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities (Rules VIII.C.3.).

The USBE SES uses the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) to monitor and support compliance with requirements in LEAs across Utah. This system aligns with the system used by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to monitor each state. UPIPS encompasses both external monitoring by the USBE SES and internal monitoring by the LEA. The purpose of UPIPS is to use monitoring to improve procedural compliance and outcomes for students with disabilities. This data-driven approach to monitoring provides a systematic way for the USBE SES and the LEA to evaluate the impact special education services have on student achievement and outcomes.

UPIPS monitoring also helps generate data the USBE SES is required to report to OSEP regarding the Indicators on the SPP/APR. The USBE SES compiles the data for each Indicator for the entire state to determine whether targets were met.

Data used for the SPP/APR Indicators are also used by the USBE SES for the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) process. The USBE SES annually sends a letter to each LEA reporting the LEA performance on each APR Indicator in relation to the state targets along with additional data points. The USBE SES determines a level of risk for each LEA as well as a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier. The USBE SES provides tiered supports and activities for improvement and risk mitigation based on the LEA level of identified risk. LEAs must develop an annual program improvement plan (PIP) to use as a tool in reducing their individual high-risk Indicators and improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

The overall system is based on the following principles or themes:

- Continuity: Monitoring is continuous rather than episodic, is linked to systemic change, and is integrated with self-assessment, continuous feedback, and response.
- Partnership with Stakeholders: The USBE SES and LEAs collaborate with diverse stakeholders in collection and analysis of self-assessment data; identification of critical issues and solutions to problems; and development, implementation, and oversight of improvement strategies to ensure compliance and improved results for students with disabilities.
- LEA Accountability: LEAs are accountable for identifying strengths and areas of concern based upon data analysis; identifying, implementing, and revising strategies for program improvement; and submitting annual measurement and progress reports through PIPs.
- Data-Driven Self-Assessment Process: LEAs work with stakeholders to design and implement a self-assessment process to review and improve outcomes for students with disabilities using data that align with the USBE and the LEA performance goals, and the APR Indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the self-assessment process may include, the Utah State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), APR Indicators, personnel needs, and other LEA improvement efforts and initiatives.
- Technical Assistance: The UPIPS process is continuous. Technical assistance is a critical component of program improvement. The USBE SES provides technical assistance and professional learning. LEAs are encouraged to evaluate and include technical assistance as part of their PIPs.

Intro – Identification and Correction of Noncompliance

The USBE reviews data collected from LEAs to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and USBE Rules. Data collected on the date of full monitoring visits and Indicator-specific file reviews are reported in the SPP/APR as the level of compliance. As outlined by OSEP, the LEA is not provided an opportunity to correct noncompliance prior to reporting.

Intro – Correction of Noncompliance

OSEP requires that all noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date of identification of noncompliance. The USBE created a method that will require the least amount of time and effort for LEAs while providing the USBE with evidence verifying corrections.

Before the USBE can conclude and report that noncompliance has been corrected, it must first verify, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that the LEA: 1) has corrected each individual case of student-specific noncompliance (Prong 1), and 2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., subsequently achieved 100% compliance) (Prong 2), based on USBE SES review of the corrections data.

USBE Tiered Support

The multi-tiered technical assistance process is in place to ensure LEAs can access the information and resources necessary to provide high quality and compliant services to students with disabilities. Using the RDA process, all LEAs are assigned to a Tier level which designates the type of supports they will receive.

Supporting Tier

LEAs in the Supporting Tier demonstrate the minimum level of risk. They show successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations, acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional learning. LEA-specific areas of need/improvement are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA. A progress report on the PIP is submitted annually by the LEA. LEA special education program implementation is supported by the USBE.

Guiding Tier

LEAs in the Guiding Tier demonstrate low risk. They show successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations, acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional learning. One or more areas of need have been identified. USBE and LEA identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA with guidance from the USBE. A progress report on the PIP is submitted annually by the LEA. LEA special education program implementation is guided by the USBE for LEAs in this tier.

Assisting Tier

LEAs in the Assisting Tier demonstrate medium risk. They have shown one or more areas of moderate need. USBE identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA with assistance from the mentor assigned through the USBE. A progress report on the PIP may be reviewed by the assigned mentor before the plan is

submitted. LEA special education program implementation is assisted by the USBE for LEAs in this tier.

Coaching Tier
LEAs in the Coaching Tier demonstrate high risk. They have demonstrated either one area of intense need or multiple areas of moderate need. USBE identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP jointly developed by the LEA and USBE. A progress report on the PIP is submitted annually by the LEA and may be reviewed by the coach assigned through the USBE before the plan is submitted. LEA special education program implementation is coached by the USBE for LEAs in this tier.

Directing Tier
LEAs in the Directing Tier demonstrate highest risk. They have demonstrated multiple areas of moderate and/or intensive need. USBE identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP jointly developed the LEA and USBE. At a minimum, a written progress report based on the PIP is submitted annually by the LEA. The report may be reviewed by the coach assigned through the USBE prior to submission. LEA special education program implementation is directed by the USBE for LEAs in this tier.

Intro – Technical Assistance System:

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

COVID-19 resulted in a revision to the way USBE provides technical assistance (TA). The adjustments included:

- All meetings moved to a virtual format.
- Asynchronous and synchronous learning opportunities.
- A webpage with resources for administrators and teachers to address COVID-19.
- Virtual monitoring visits and utilizing an online document storage platform.

Indicators 1 and 2
The USBE SES developed a TA video module for understanding Indicators 1 and 2 data including support documents for LEAs to better understand Indicators 1 and 2 data reports.

Indicator 3
TA provided to help LEAs improve student academic outcomes included: 1% monitoring visits focusing on students with significant cognitive disabilities, RDA coaching, data meetings, alternate achievement standards instruction and assessment professional learning experiences.

Indicator 5
The USBE SES provided TA on special education service time, environment, and placement. Utah LEAs continue to increase the percent of students with disabilities receiving most of their services in general education settings with support through co-teaching and ongoing collaboration between general and special education teachers. The USBE SES and LEAs created Reflective Framework of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to help ensure teams look at compliance and best practice when developing a student's IEP. This framework is shared with

LEAs to determine ways that better serve students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Indicators 6, 7, and 12
The USBE provided TA to LEAs on early childhood environments, preschool outcome data collection, and Part C to Part B transition requirements. TA was provided to LEAs at monthly statewide preschool coordinator meetings and through professional learning opportunities.

Indicators 13 and 14
The USBE SES brought multiple online resources together using the Padlet online tool. The Padlets cover a wide range of topics related to secondary transition such as transition assessments, the transition process, virtual resources, and postschool outcomes. The Padlets offer educators a central location to access links to needed resources and support to maximize their professional learning opportunities.

Indicators 15 and 16
The USBE SES provides ongoing information regarding current trends in dispute resolution data as well as TA to address recurring issues at quarterly meetings with special education directors.

National Technical Assistance Participation

- Utah's Part B IDEA determination in 2021 was "meets requirements." National TA participation has been a strength as USBE works to improve outcomes. The USBE appreciates the resources and the opportunity to receive TA from various centers to improve state performance leading to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. COVID-19 increased the need for collaboration with national TA partners and other states to address challenges to systems and data collection.

Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14
The USBE attended National Technical Assistance on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) state-to-state sharing calls on collaboration between Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Career Technical Education. The USBE receives ongoing Indicator 14 support from Jennifer Jacobs, Utah's Indicator 14 contractor with the Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) #7. The USBE continues to facilitate an inter-agency state transition team including the USBE secondary transition specialists, the USBE Career and Technical Education (CTE) special populations specialist, the Utah State Office of Rehabilitation (USOR) transition specialist, the USOR Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) specialist and the Institute for Disability Research, Policy and Practice (IDRPP) School to Work specialists. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for transition and anticipates expanding to include school counseling. The team continues to attend the NTACT:C Capacity Building Institute and the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT:C.

Indicator 3
The USBE participated in two TA groups hosted by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO): the 1% cap Community of Practice (CoP) and the Time, Instructional Effectiveness, Engagement, and State Support for Inclusive Practices (TIES) center Peer Learning Group (PLG) related to the 1% cap and students with significant cognitive disabilities. The CoP and the TIES center focus on building capacity of IEP teams to increase participation in assessments, further

development and implementation of a 1% data analysis and use best practices for inclusion of students with significant cognitive disabilities.

The USBE utilized technical assistance from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to ensure access for students with disabilities in formative assessment measuring progress toward goals linked to state standards. The USBE participates in the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Evidence-Based Practices Collaborative meeting monthly with state partners to discuss current research on evidence-based practices.

The USBE participates in a low incidence workgroup with Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), a multi-state collaborative. States collaborate and share data and implementation plans regarding assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Indicators 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, and 16
The USBE received TA from TAESE, the IDEA Data Center (IDC), NCSI, and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). COVID-19 resources provided by these national TA partners helped the USBE and LEAs navigate processes differently. NCSI collaboratives focused on COVID-19 implications, have provided insight for the USBE regarding monitoring processes, virtual formats of service delivery, and data collection. The IDC provided the USBE with support and TA in developing protocols that operationalized agency processes for monitoring Indicators 4, 9, and 10.

The USBE Preschool Specialist participated in calls with the IDC, the ECTA, and the NCSI. The USBE received additional general and COVID-19-specific TA from the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), the Division of Early Childhood (DEC), and the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC).

NCSI was utilized for Indicator 8 in conjunction with technical assistance through the Flamboyan Foundation fellowship. During the 20-month fellowship, the USBE received coaching and professional learning and collaborated with fellows from other cities as they worked to create solutions tailored to meet the needs of their local contexts. The USBE continues to work with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's OSEP-funded Parent Training Information Center) in collecting and analyzing data to address statewide needs.

The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) provided guidance regarding Indicators 15 and 16. CADRE training and information included resources related to COVID-19 impacts on due process. USBE staff attended training on conducting virtual mediations and hearings and provided TA to all dispute resolution contractors on using virtual platforms (if needed) and ensuring that dispute resolution processes continued despite COVID-19 restrictions. The USBE participated in quarterly mediation, due process, State complaint, and IEP facilitator workgroups hosted by TAESE.

Intro – Professional Development System:

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

COVID-19 resulted in a revision to the way USBE provides professional learning. The adjustments included:

- In-person professional learning moved to virtual formats.
- All meetings conducted virtually.
- Asynchronous and synchronous learning opportunities.
- Protecting class time by limiting meetings and professional learning experiences during school hours.

In July 2020, the USBE hosted a free annual law conference that over 1,000 educators, lawyers, and administrators attended to receive current information on IDEA requirements. Sessions included dispute resolution, special education law, family engagement, and compliant practices.

LEAs participate in data literacy/analysis experiences annually where Indicator results are shared and reviewed.

The online Training Request Portal (TRP) allows LEAs to request specific training in areas of need. The TRP submission includes special education and all other areas of student support at USBE (e.g., equity, prevention, behavior support, etc.). This provides an opportunity for USBE cross-collaboration that would be better served by more systemic professional learning experiences. The USBE coordinating staff meet weekly to review requests and assign staff to follow up on the requests. Requests lead to professional learning opportunities, technical assistance, and support. Eighty-eight LEAs made 281 requests in the 2020-2021 school year.

LEAs identified as high risk are provided additional technical assistance and support. The RDA Tier Determination determines the level of support annually. All LEAs are provided professional learning, technical assistance, and other online resources.

LEAs in the Supporting Tier have access to funding for pilot projects or approaches that have the goal of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

LEAs in the Guiding Tier have access to technical assistance for data reviews, as well as for areas of identified need. LEAs have access to targeted support from the USBE.

LEAs in the Assisting Tier are provided professional learning on data reviews and a root cause analysis. The USBE provides the LEA with support up to two hours a month to help reduce risk. During 2020–2021, 15 LEAs were provided this level of support. Currently, 18 LEAs are receiving this level of support.

LEAs in the Coaching Tier are provided with professional learning on conducting a data review and a root cause analysis. They can receive information from LEAs who have effectively decreased their risk as well as collaborate with the USBE and other at-risk LEAs. The assigned coach provides support up to four hours per month. During 2020–2021, 15 LEAs were provided this level of support. Currently, 16 LEAs are receiving this level of support.

LEAs in the Directing Tier are provided with professional learning on conducting a data review and a root cause analysis. They will have the opportunity to receive information from LEAs who have effectively decreased their risk as well as collaborate with the USBE and other at-risk LEAs. The assigned coach provides intensive support up to six hours per month. The USBE provides support to the LEA in building capacity across the LEA, and financial supports are available to assist the LEA in filling programmatic needs. During 2020–2021, five LEAs were provided this level of support. Currently, 17 LEAs are receiving this level of support.

Indicators 1 and 2
The USBE SES provided training on Indicators 1 and 2 for new special education directors and special education directors with high risk scores for these Indicators. The USBE SES also provided data literacy training for LEAs in March of 2021. Approximately 100 LEA staff attended these trainings over the two school years.

Indicator 3
Professional learning provided to help LEAs improve student academic outcomes included: Co-teaching professional learning, literacy and mathematics specific training, alternate achievement standards instruction and assessment professional learning experiences, online book studies with teachers and parents, and accommodations and assessment administration training.

Indicator 8
Each year, the USBE helps onboard new special education directors through a Strong Start program where parent engagement is taught and discussed.

Indicators 13 and 14
The USBE places high importance on providing the foundation for writing compliant and effective post-secondary transition plans through an introductory segment on Indicator 14 training. All statewide and LEA data are presented to participants along with a tutorial on how to access their LEA information on the Utah Post School Outcomes Survey website.

The USBE offers a series of professional learning opportunities to support LEAs with sessions focused on post-secondary outcomes including:

- Strong Start: Training on Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 was provided to approximately 30 new special education directors.
- Running Start: Training on Indicator 13 was provided to 122 new special education teachers.
- Writing Compliant Transition Plans: An online course with a dedicated coaching module for participants to ask questions in each area of the transition plan. Participants were required to complete all the course modules and a self-assessment of a transition-aged student's IEP. The course was completed by approximately 100 educators.
- Indicator 13 and 14 Data Literacy Training: Targeted sessions for LEAs to examine and analyze their Indicator reports for areas of strength and concern. Approximately 75 educators were in attendance.
- Indicator 14 Training: A live virtual training was provided in May 2021 to 57 LEAs interested in collecting Post School Outcomes Survey data. Following the training, 33 LEAs conducted their own surveys, and 24 LEAs conducted surveys after a contractor conducted the surveys.
- Fall 2020 Transition Institute: Delivered in a self-paced online learning management system instead of the traditional in-person format. LEAs participated with their post-secondary transition teams in the sessions. Approximately 100 people participated, representing 24

LEAs with partnering agencies participating from around Utah. Support was provided by the USBE SES to transition team leaders in the form of virtual community of practice sessions during the 2020–2021 school year to guide them in work with their LEA transition teams.

- Building Meaningful Lives: Training to build capacity in LEAs and create a statewide community of practice around inclusion and employment for transition-aged youth with complex needs. Site-based teams had an opportunity to participate in a series of facilitated conversations and guided practice to implement the tools and strategies presented in webinars. The webinars and community of practice workshops were held during the school year and included 25 participants (educators, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and parents).
- Coaching: The USBE SES held a series of monthly open house coaching sessions for Indicators 13 and 14 December 2020–May 2021 to provide support with writing compliant transition plans and on how to navigate the Utah Post School Outcomes Survey. A total of 80 participants representing 22 LEAs participated in 2020–2021.

Capacity Building Institute (CBI) Team: This inter-agency state team annually attends the CBI and develops and incorporates tools and professional learning for LEA transition teams. During the 2020–2021 school year, the Utah team developed a collaboration tool and resources for LEA transition teams to help develop and strengthen collaboration efforts to improve the outcomes of their students with disabilities.

Indicators 15 and 16
The USBE SES helps onboard new special education directors at Strong Start where dispute resolution processes and conflict management techniques are taught. The USBE SES provided training to due process hearing officers and other dispute resolution contractors to mitigate COVID-19's impact on dispute resolution processes.

Intro – Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)

- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the

impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12

During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13

The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

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

YES

Intro – Number of Parent Members:

33

Intro – Parent Members Engagement:

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

Twenty parents attended the APR Summit and provided input on Indicators. Additional feedback was provided by parents through the survey sent following the event. The USBE SES also included parents who did and who did not participate in the APR summit or respond to the subsequent survey by presenting information about the target setting process to the USEAP, the UPC staff, and the Utah Parent Teacher Association (PTA) leadership.

Intro – Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

USBE SES staff discussed with members of the USEAP and the UPC staff ways to reach out to and connect with parents who are traditionally underrepresented in the stakeholder feedback collection process. Members of the USEAP and UPC staff both proactively shared information about the target setting process with their parent constituencies from diverse backgrounds. The USBE SES will continue to work with these leaders to increase the feedback we receive from traditionally underrepresented parents.

Intro – Soliciting Public Input:

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

The stakeholders listed in the "Broad Stakeholder Input" section were provided formal and informal notification on the APR summit and the additional survey seeking input. Mechanisms included announcements during meetings, emails, newsletter notifications, website publication, and individual conversations.

Notifications began in the fall of 2020. In June 2021, a flyer including registration for the APR summit was provided to stakeholders through email and newsletters. It is evident the public received notification and responded, as over 100 participants attended and provided feedback.

In addition, stakeholders were sent the survey following the event through emails and newsletters to provide additional perspective and input. The survey resulted in over 100 responses.

Intro – Making Results Available to the Public:

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

The results of the target setting process where shared with LEA Special Education leaders, the USEAP, the UPC staff, the Disability Law Center (DLC) staff, relevant Utah PTA leadership, as well as the relevant staff at all State of Utah Agencies and most of the nonprofit organizations that serve individuals with disabilities. The target setting process results were also shared in newsletters and on the USBE special education website.

Intro – Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

Starting in February each year, the State reports to the public on its progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The SPP/APR is posted on the USBE website.

The final SPP/APR is shared at the first regularly scheduled meetings of the USBE and USEAP and with the special education directors after submission. Results are also shared with the UPC. Prior to April 15 of each year (within 120 days of the State's submission of its APR), the USBE SES prepares and publishes a summary of indicators that are required to be publicly reported for each LEA. The summary is posted on the USBE website and is made available for posting on LEA websites. The results of the FFY 2020 APR will be reported to the Utah State Board of Education in the March 2022 Board meeting.

Intro – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro – OSEP Response

Intro – Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

1 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

1 – Data Source

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

1 – Measurement

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

1 – Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

1 – Indicator Data

1 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	67.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	69.59%	71.48%	72.91%	74.37%	75.86%
Data	67.93%	70.22%	69.36%	69.97%	72.36%

1 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	67.90%	67.90%	68.66%	69.43%	70.95%	74.00%

1 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The

USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

1 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,836
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	83

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	192
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	1,522
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,176

1 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,836	6,809	72.36%	67.90%	56.34%	Did not meet target	N/A

1 – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

The prepopulated EdFacts data above are incorrect. The correct data are as follows:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) = 3,837
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) = 119
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) = 1,163

The prepopulated FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data above are also incorrect. The correct data are as follows:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma = 3,837
- Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) = 5,394

FFY 2020 Data = 71.13%. The State has met target the target of 67.90%. There is no slippage.

1 – Graduation Conditions

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

The USBE Graduation requirements include a minimum of 24 units of credit through course completion or through competency assessment:

- Language Arts (4.0 Units of Credit)
- Mathematics (3.0 Units of Credit)

- Science (3.0 Units of Credit)
- Social Studies (3.0 Units of Credit)
- Arts (1.5 Units of Credit)
- Physical and Health Education (2.0 Units of Credit)
- Career and Technical Education (1.0 Units of Credit)
- Digital Studies (0.5 Units of Credit)
- General Financial Literacy (0.5 Units of Credit)
- Electives (5.5 Units of Credit)
- Library Media Skills (integrated into all subject areas)

LEAs use USBE-approved summative adaptive assessments to assess student mastery (R277-700-6). Students with disabilities served by special education programs satisfy high school completion or graduation requirements, consistent with state and federal law and the students' IEPs (R277-705-4).

An LEA may substitute a student's course requirements for graduation to meet the unique educational needs of a student if: the student has a disability; and the substitutions to the student's graduation requirements are made through the student's individual IEP. LEAs document the nature and extent of the substitution made to a student's course requirements in the student's IEP (R277-700-6(23)). Whether or not an IEP team substitutes a student with a disability's course requirements, the student graduates with a regular diploma.

For additional information, the USBE graduation requirements are outlined in Utah Administrative Rules R277-700-6 and R277-705. The USBE Special Education Services Graduation Guidelines for Students with Disabilities outlines the process for amending graduation requirements.

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

NO

1 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In December 2017, the USBE passed the Alternate Diploma for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The state-defined Alternate Diploma is outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (20 USC § 6301; R277-705-5.).

An LEA may award an alternate diploma to a student with a significant cognitive disability if the student accesses grade-level core standards through the Essential Elements, the student's IEP team makes graduation substitutions in the same content area from a list of alternative courses approved by the USBE, and the student meets all graduation requirements prior to exiting school at or before age 22. An Alternate Diploma may not indicate that the recipient is a student with a disability.

The USBE provides a list of alternative courses that may be considered for a student with significant cognitive disabilities working to receive an Alternate Diploma. An LEA may submit courses to the USBE to be considered for possible inclusion on the list of alternate courses.

Utah's Alternate Diploma for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are not counted in Indicator 1 graduation calculations. Utah had 83 students earn the Alternate Diploma in FFY 2020.

The baseline data is reflective of the new form of measurement used for graduation determinations. It is different than the data outlined in the historical data which is based on the old measurement format. It is different than the data outlined in the historical data which is based on the old measurement format. Note that we indicate that the baseline graduation rate is 67.90% for FFY2018. However, the Data Table shows the FFY2018 graduation rate to be 69.97%. The reason for the discrepancy is that the USBE re-calculated the FFY2018 rate to be based on EdFacts File FS009 in order to use the same calculation methodology that is used for the FFY2020 graduation rate. During Utah's APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 1 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and new measurement formats. Stakeholders reviewed historical data based on the new measurement method and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

Starting March 16, 2020, Utah schools were closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Without adequate time to prepare for all students to participate in distance learning, a lot of LEAs reported substantial numbers of students with whom they were unable to engage. The USBE advised LEAs that rather than strictly adhering to the continuing enrollment "10 day rule," whereby students with 10 consecutive unexcused absences should be dropped from active enrollment, they should keep students in enrollment and continue efforts to re-engage all students. Independent auditors' Agreed Upon Procedures (AUP) reports on the year-end student membership data included the footnote, "Beginning March 16, 2020, the school implemented the state mandated soft closure of schools in response to COVID-19; therefore, no procedures on continuing enrollment measurement have been performed after this date." The impact of this change in practice on data included lower than expected mobility and chronic absence rates (based on trend data), higher than expected attendance and average daily membership rates, and decreases in the numbers of students reported as dropout exiters during the period from March 16 through the end of the 2019–2020 school year. With fewer students reported as dropouts in the 2019–2020 exiter data, the Indicator 1 graduation rate may be slightly inflated and the Indicator 2 dropout rate may be slightly under-reported.

LEAs developed their own strategies and practices regarding student credit completion toward graduation in response to school soft closures due to COVID-19 in the spring of 2020. The USBE released Graduation and Grading Guidance in April 2020 to help LEAs support students toward graduation. In the fall of 2020, the USBE formed a graduation workgroup advisory council to develop targeted guidance for LEAs to support student completion of graduation requirements. This guidance document is currently in the draft stage.

1 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

1 – Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

2 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

2 – Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

2 – Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

2 – Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

2 – Indicator Data

2 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	25.81%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	37.90%	36.00%	34.20%	32.49%	30.86%
Data	29.82%	27.69%	27.04%	25.75%	23.56%

2 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	25.81%	25.81%	24.58%	23.35%	20.90%	16.00%

2 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators

- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12

During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13

The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets

cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

2 – Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

2– Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,836
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	83
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	192
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	1,522
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,176

2 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,176	6,809	23.56%	25.81%	17.27%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The Indicator 2 dropout rate comes from the EDFacts 009 report data according to the EDFacts 009 specifications. EDFacts definition of Single-Year Dropouts are students ages 14-21 who left with a reason of Unknown, Withdrawn, Dropout, Expelled, Transferred to Adult Education, Exited to Take the GED, or Graduation Pending. Additionally, if the student finished the school year and was expected to return to school the next year or transferred to another LEA within the state and did not reappear by September 30 of the following school year, then the student counts as a dropout. Finally, if the student was a retained senior but did not reappear by September 30 of the following school year, then the student counts as a dropout. This count does not include students who transferred to home school, private school, or a school outside of the state or country. Students who withdrew for medical reasons are also excluded from the dropout count.

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

NO

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

2 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The prepopulated EdFacts data above are incorrect. The correct data are as follows:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) = 3,837
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) = 119
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) = 1,163

The prepopulated FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data above are also incorrect. The correct data are as follows:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out = 1,163
- Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) = 5,394

FFY 2020 Data = 21.56%. The State has met target the target of 25.81%. There is no slippage.

The USBE notifies each LEA flagged with a high dropout rate in September and provides a preliminary event dropout report to review before the October 10 data deadline. LEAs are given guidance on coding corrections and dropout recovery practices through USBE training, technical assistance documents, and individually as needed.

The baseline data is reflective of the new form of measurement used for dropout determinations. It is different than the data outlined in the historical data which is based on the old measurement format. Note that we indicate that the baseline dropout rate is 25.81% for FFY2018. However, the Data Table shows the FFY2018 drop-out rate to be 25.75%. The reason for the discrepancy is that the USBE re-calculated the FFY2018 rate to be based on EdFacts File FS009 AND did not include "deceased" in the denominator based on the new method for calculating dropout rate in order to use the same calculation methodology that is used for the FFY2020 dropout rate. During Utah's APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 2 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and changes in measurement. Stakeholders reviewed historical data based on the new measurement and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

The USBE reported a baseline of 25.80% for FFY2018 in the narrative regarding stakeholder input in its February 2022 SPP/APR submission. After a review of the new calculation to match the requirements in EdFacts File FS009, it was determined the correct baseline is 25.81%. The baseline data, targets for 2020 and 2021, and the stakeholder input narrative have been updated accordingly.

Starting March 16, 2020, Utah schools were closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Without adequate time to prepare for all students to participate in distance learning, a lot of LEAs reported substantial numbers of students with whom they were unable to engage. The USBE advised LEAs that rather than strictly adhering to the continuing enrollment "10 day rule," whereby students with 10 consecutive unexcused absences should be dropped from active enrollment, they should keep students in enrollment and continue efforts to re-engage all students. Independent auditors' Agreed Upon Procedures (AUP) reports on the year-end student membership data included the footnote, "Beginning March 16, 2020, the school implemented the state mandated soft closure of schools in response to COVID-19; therefore, no procedures on continuing enrollment measurement have been performed after this date." The impact of this change in practice on data included lower than expected mobility and chronic absence rates (based on trend data), higher than expected attendance and average daily membership rates, and decreases in the numbers of students reported as dropout exiters during the period from March 16 through the end of the 2019–2020 school year. With fewer students reported as dropouts in the 2019–2020 exiter data, the Indicator 1 graduation rate may be slightly inflated and the Indicator 2 dropout rate may be slightly under-reported.

2 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

2 – Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

3A – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

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

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

3A – Data Source

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

3A – Measurement

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

3A – Instructions

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

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

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

3A – Indicator Data

3A – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	90.64%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	81.14%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	68.40%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	90.21%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	77.45%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	65.24%

3A – Targets

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

3A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a

given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

3A – FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3A – Reading Assessment Data Source:

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

3A – Reading Assessment Data Source Date:

03/30/2022

3A – Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	7,771	6,299	5,187
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,512	4,673	2,489
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	147	21	658
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	385	417	401

3A – Math Assessment Data Source:

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

3A – Math Assessment Data Source Date:

03/30/2022

3A – Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	7,771	6,288	5,184
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,475	4,424	2,358
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	150	29	621
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	385	417	403

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

3A – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,044	7,771	N/A	95.00%	90.64%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,111	6,299	N/A	95.00%	81.14%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,548	5,187	N/A	95.00%	68.40%	N/A	N/A

3A – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,010	7,771	N/A	95.00%	90.21%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,870	6,288	N/A	95.00%	77.45%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,382	5,184	N/A	95.00%	65.24%	N/A	N/A

3A – Regulatory Information

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

3A – Public Reporting Information

3A – Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Each school's overall participation rate for regular assessments Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) grades 4 & 8 and Utah Aspire Plus grade 10 are posted on their individual school report card available on Utah's Data Gateway.

Participation rates of students with disabilities who participated with accommodations and without accommodations on the regular assessment are reported on the USBE Data and Statistics Report webpage. On the "Assessments" tab under the "Alternate Assessments" header, click on the most recent year's Excel spreadsheet link. In the first tab on the spreadsheet labeled "Participation by Assessment Type" it reports: Number of Students with Disabilities Tested, Percent Participation in Regular Assessment, Percent Participation in Regular Assessment with Accommodations, Percent Participation in Alternate Assessment, at the state, LEA, and school level.

The notes section, the fourth tab, on the spreadsheet outlines USBE's policy for protecting students' personally identifiable information, data for groups with fewer than ten students is reported as "n<10." For groups with fewer than forty students, counts are not shown and percentages are obscured by providing the range within which the percentage falls (e.g., 43% would display as 40-49%).

3A – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The prepopulated Reading Assessment Participation EdFacts data and the prepopulated FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment data above were incorrect in the USBE's original SPP/APR submission, and OSEP was unable to determine if targets reflected an improvement over the baseline. The correct data has been submitted and is now reflected in the tables above. The targets now reflect an improvement over the baseline.

In FFY 2019, the USBE submitted a federal waiver to the U.S. Department of Education requesting allowance for the suspension of the required administration of Utah's state spring summative assessments used for both federal and state accountability. The waiver was submitted in response to the statewide school dismissal in March of 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The U.S. Department of Education accepted Utah's waiver request on March 27, 2020. The cancellation of spring 2020 summative assessments resulted in the absence of assessment data used for reporting on Indicator 3 for FFY 2019.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 3 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from FFY 2020 reflect current Utah student abilities and was determined to be appropriate.

Indicator 3 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic during FFY 2020, which is reflected in USBE's data. The data indicate a decrease in the number of students who participated in state spring summative assessments RISE grades 4 & 8, Utah Aspire Plus grade 10, and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) alternate assessments grades 4, 8, & 10. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Utah made progress in FFY 2018 in participation for all state spring summative assessments and met the target on grade 10 reading. Utah's previous non-participants consisted mostly of students who had a parental opt-out. However, in this year's data, the predominant non-participants were students who either had no test records or were reported as absent – did not test.

Utah had LEAs who created online course options for students in the 2020–2021 school year. Additionally, Utah's already established online schools saw an increase in the enrollment of students. Utah only had 31% of LEAs with full-time in-person learning. LEAs offered several options for receiving instruction online for students who participated in the state spring summative assessments because remote testing was not an option. Some LEAs offered testing on weekends, some set up rooms with outdoor access so high-risk students did not have to come through the building, and some LEAs offered to go to students' homes to administer tests. The USBE allowed LEAs to use the entire 10-to-14-week testing windows to complete assessment

administration, rather than the typical 6-week window. Even with these assorted options, the participation of students with disabilities declined.

With a decline in FFY 2020 participation on the state spring summative assessments, the trend has been a decline in proficiency as well. In FFY 2018, Utah saw an increase in proficiency when participation began to increase. If trend lines hold, Utah proficiency rates should begin to increase again when state spring summative assessment participation increases.

Due to the impacts of COVID-19, the USBE advises those using assessment data to interpret the 2020–2021school year scores with extreme caution. Utah's state spring summative assessment results of the 2021–2022 school year will be an important source of confirmatory information to better understand the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on student achievement.

3A – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A – OSEP Response

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

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

3A – Required Actions

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

3B – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

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

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

3B – Data Source

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

3B – Measurement

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

3B – Instructions

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

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

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

3B – Indicator Data

3B – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	14.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	7.31%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	8.58%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	19.74%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.02%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	3.19%

3B – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.51%	14.51%	14.75%	15.00%	15.48%	16.45%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	7.31%	7.31%	7.67%	8.03%	8.74%	10.17%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	8.58%	8.58%	8.75%	8.92%	9.27%	9.95%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.74%	19.74%	19.91%	20.09%	20.43%	21.12%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.02%	6.02%	6.15%	6.28%	6.54%	7.05%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.19%	3.19%	3.39%	3.58%	3.98%	4.76%

3B – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a

given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

3B FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3B Reading Assessment Data Source:

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

3B Reading Assessment Data Source Date:

03/03/2022

3B – Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	6,659	4,694	3,147
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	960	339	215
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	4	55

3B – Math Assessment Data Source:

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

3B – Math Assessment Data Source Date:

03/03/2022

3B – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	6,625	4,453	2,979
Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,299	266	80
Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9	2	15

3B – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	966	6,659	N/A	14.51%	14.51%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	343	4,694	N/A	7.31%	7.31%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	270	3,147	N/A	8.58%	8.58%	N/A	N/A

3B – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,308	6,625	N/A	19.74%	19.74%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	268	4,453	N/A	6.02%	6.02%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	95	2,979	N/A	3.19%	3.19%	N/A	N/A

3B – Regulatory Information

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

3B – Public Reporting Information

3B – Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The achievement of all students and students with disabilities for the regular assessments, Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) grades 4 & 8 and Utah Aspire Plus grade 10, are posted on the individual schools' report cards available on Utah's Data Gateway. To view the state-level data, click on "View State Report," click on "View Details" in the "Achievement" tile under the Performance tab, then click on "View Details" for each individual subject.

3B –Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2019, the USBE submitted a federal waiver to the U.S. Department of Education requesting allowance for the suspension of the required administration of Utah's state spring summative assessments used for both federal and state accountability. The waiver was submitted in response to the statewide school dismissal in March of 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The U.S. Department of Education accepted Utah's waiver request on March 27, 2020. The cancellation of spring 2020 summative assessments resulted in the absence of assessment data used for reporting on Indicator 3 for FFY 2019.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 3 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from FFY 2020 reflect current Utah student abilities and was determined to be appropriate.

Indicator 3 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic during FFY 2020, which is reflected in USBE's data. The data indicate a decrease in the number of students who participated in state spring summative assessments RISE grades 4 & 8, Utah Aspire Plus grade 10, and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) alternate assessments grades 4, 8, & 10. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Utah made progress in FFY 2018 in participation for all state spring summative assessments and met the target on grade 10 reading. Utah's previous non-participants consisted mostly of students who had a parental opt-out. However, in this year's data, the predominant non-participants were students who either had no test records or were reported as absent – did not test.

Utah had LEAs who created online course options for students in the 2020–2021 school year. Additionally, Utah's already established online schools saw an increase in the enrollment of students. Utah only had 31% of LEAs with full-time in-person learning. LEAs offered several options for receiving instruction online for students who participated in the state spring summative assessments because remote testing was not an option. Some LEAs offered testing on weekends, some set up rooms with outdoor access so high-risk students did not have to come through the building, and some LEAs offered to go to students' homes to administer tests. The USBE allowed LEAs to use the entire 10-to-14-week testing windows to complete assessment

administration, rather than the typical 6-week window. Even with these assorted options, the participation of students with disabilities declined.

With a decline in FFY 2020 participation on the state spring summative assessments, the trend has been a decline in proficiency as well. In FFY 2018, Utah saw an increase in proficiency when participation began to increase. If trend lines hold, Utah proficiency rates should begin to increase again when state spring summative assessment participation increases.

Due to the impacts of COVID-19, the USBE advises those using assessment data to interpret the 2020–2021school year scores with extreme caution. Utah's state spring summative assessment results of the 2021–2022 school year will be an important source of confirmatory information to better understand the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on student achievement.

3B – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B – OSEP Response

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

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

3B – Required Actions

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

3C – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

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

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

3C – Data Source

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

3C – Measurement

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

3C – Instructions

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

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

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

3C – Indicator Data

3C – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	15.06%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	23.74%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	29.43%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	31.43%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.24%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	12.41%

3C – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	15.06%	15.06%	15.17%	15.28%	15.49%	15.92%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	23.74%	23.74%	23.91%	24.09%	24.43%	25.12%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	29.43%	29.43%	29.62%	29.80%	30.17%	30.91%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	31.43%	31.43%	31.56%	31.68%	31.93%	32.43%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.24%	6.24%	6.38%	6.53%	6.81%	7.38%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	12.41%	12.41%	12.56%	12.71%	13.01%	13.60%

3C – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for

target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

3C – FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3C – Reading Assessment Data Source:

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

3C – Reading Assessment Data Source Date:

03/03/2022

3C – Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	385	417	401
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	58	99	118

3C – Math Assessment Data Source:

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

3C – Math Assessment Data Source Date:

03/03/2022

3C – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	385	417	403
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	121	26	50

3C – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	58	385	N/A	15.06%	15.06%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	99	417	N/A	23.74%	23.74%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	118	401	N/A	29.43%	29.43%	N/A	N/A

3C – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	121	385	N/A	31.43%	31.43%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	26	417	N/A	6.24%	6.24%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	50	403	N/A	12.41%	12.41%	N/A	N/A

3C – Regulatory Information

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

3C – Public Reporting Information

3C – Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The achievement of all students and students with disabilities for the alternate assessment, Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) grades 4, 8, and 10, are reported on the USBE Data and Statistics Report webpage. On the "Assessments" tab under the "Alternate Assessments" header, click on the most recent years excel spreadsheet link. The second tab "Proficiency by Subject Area" reports the proficiency of students who participated in the alternate assessment as well as the comparison to the proficiency of student with disabilities on the regular assessment and to the proficiency of all students on the regular assessment by subject area. The third tab reports the proficiency of students who participated in the alternate assessment as well as the comparison to the proficiency of student with disabilities on the regular assessment and to the proficiency of all students on the regular assessment by grade level.

The notes section, the fourth tab on the spreadsheet, outlines USBE's policy for protecting students' personally identifiable information. Data for groups with fewer than ten students is reported as "n<10." For groups with fewer than forty students, counts are not shown and percentages are obscured by providing the range within which the percentage falls (e.g., 43% would display as 40-49%).

3C – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2019, the USBE submitted a federal waiver to the U.S. Department of Education requesting allowance for the suspension of the required administration of Utah's state spring summative assessments used for both federal and state accountability. The waiver was submitted in response to the statewide school dismissal in March of 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The U.S. Department of Education accepted Utah's waiver request on March 27, 2020. The cancellation of spring 2020 summative assessments resulted in the absence of assessment data used for reporting on Indicator 3 for FFY 2019.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 3 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from FFY 2020 reflect current Utah student abilities and was determined to be appropriate.

Indicator 3 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic during FFY 2020, which is reflected in USBE's data. The data indicate a decrease in the number of students who participated in state spring summative assessments RISE grades 4 & 8, Utah Aspire Plus grade 10, and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) alternate assessments grades 4, 8, & 10. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Utah made progress in FFY 2018 in participation for all state spring summative assessments and met the target on grade 10 reading. Utah's previous non-participants consisted mostly of students who had a parental opt-out. However, in this year's data, the predominant non-

participants were students who either had no test records or were reported as absent – did not test.

Utah had LEAs who created online course options for students in the 2020–2021 school year. Additionally, Utah's already established online schools saw an increase in the enrollment of students. Utah only had 31% of LEAs with full-time in-person learning. LEAs offered several options for receiving instruction online for students who participated in the state spring summative assessments because remote testing was not an option. Some LEAs offered testing on weekends, some set up rooms with outdoor access so high-risk students did not have to come through the building, and some LEAs offered to go to students' homes to administer tests. The USBE allowed LEAs to use the entire 10-to-14-week testing windows to complete assessment administration, rather than the typical 6-week window. Even with these assorted options, the participation of students with disabilities declined.

With a decline in FFY 2020 participation on the state spring summative assessments, the trend has been a decline in proficiency as well. In FFY 2018, Utah saw an increase in proficiency when participation began to increase. If trend lines hold, Utah proficiency rates should begin to increase again when state spring summative assessment participation increases.

Due to the impacts of COVID-19, the USBE advises those using assessment data to interpret the 2020–2021school year scores with extreme caution. Utah's state spring summative assessment results of the 2021–2022 school year will be an important source of confirmatory information to better understand the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on student achievement.

3C – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C – OSEP Response

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

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

3C – Required Actions

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

3D – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

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

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

3D – Data Source

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

3D – Measurement

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

3D – Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including

both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D – Indicator Data

3D – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	23.31
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	35.63
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	39.47
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	25.22
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	30.51
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	25.62

3D – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.31	23.31	23.19	23.07	22.84	22.36
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.63	35.63	35.51	35.39	35.15	34.67
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	39.47	39.47	39.23	38.99	38.51	37.55
Math	A <=	Grade 4	25.22	25.22	25.10	24.98	24.74	24.25
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.51	30.51	30.43	30.35	30.19	29.86
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.62	25.62	25.52	25.42	25.23	24.83

3D – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the

advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

3D – FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3D – Reading Assessment Data Source:

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

3D – Reading Assessment Data Source Date:

03/03/2022

3D – Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	46,404	46,422	38,035
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	6,659	4,694	3,147
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	17,543	19,923	18,167
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	10	108
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	960	339	215
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	4	55

3D – Math Assessment Data Source:

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

3D – Math Assessment Data Source Date:

03/03/2022

3D – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	46,268	45,732	38,408
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	6,625	4,453	2,979
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	20,788	16,702	11,021

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	15	4	44
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,299	266	80
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9	2	15

3D – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.51%	37.82%	N/A	23.31%	23.31%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	7.31%	42.94%	N/A	35.63%	35.63%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	8.58%	48.05%	N/A	39.47%	39.47%	N/A	N/A

3D – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	19.74%	44.96%	N/A	25.22%	25.22%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6.02%	36.53%	N/A	30.51%	30.51%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3.19%	28.81%	N/A	25.62%	25.62%	N/A	N/A

3D – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2019, the USBE submitted a federal waiver to the U.S. Department of Education requesting allowance for the suspension of the required administration of Utah's state spring summative assessments used for both federal and state accountability. The waiver was submitted in response to the statewide school dismissal in March of 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The U.S. Department of Education accepted Utah's waiver request on March 27, 2020. The cancellation of spring 2020 summative assessments resulted in the absence of assessment data used for reporting on Indicator 3 for FFY 2019.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 3 was conducted. This is a new Indicator that was included in the review. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from FFY 2020 reflect current Utah student abilities and were determined to be appropriate.

Indicator 3 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic during FFY 2020, which is reflected in USBE's data. The data indicate a decrease in the number of students who participated in state spring summative assessments Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) grades 4 & 8, Utah Aspire Plus grade 10, and Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) alternate assessments grades 4, 8, & 10. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Utah made progress in FFY 2018 in participation for all state spring summative assessments and met the target on grade 10 reading. Utah's previous non-participants consisted mostly of students who had a parental opt-out. However, in this year's data, the predominant non-participants were students who either had no test records or were reported as absent – did not test.

Utah had LEAs who created online course options for students in the 2020–2021 school year. Additionally, Utah's already established online schools saw an increase in the enrollment of students. Utah only had 31% of LEAs with full-time in-person learning. LEAs offered several options for receiving instruction online for students who participated in the state spring summative assessments because remote testing was not an option. Some LEAs offered testing on weekends, some set up rooms with outdoor access so high-risk students did not have to come through the building, and some LEAs offered to go to students' homes to administer tests. The USBE allowed LEAs to use the entire 10-to-14-week testing windows to complete assessment administration, rather than the typical 6-week window. Even with these assorted options, the participation of students with disabilities declined.

With a decline in FFY 2020 participation on the state spring summative assessments, the trend has been a decline in proficiency as well. In FFY 2018, Utah saw an increase in proficiency when participation began to increase. If trend lines hold, Utah proficiency rates should begin to increase again when state spring summative assessment participation increases.

Due to the impacts of COVID-19, the USBE advises those using assessment data to interpret the 2020–2021school year scores with extreme caution. Utah's state spring summative assessment results of the 2021–2022 school year will be an important source of confirmatory information to better understand the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on student achievement.

3D – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D – OSEP Response

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

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

3D – Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

4A – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

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

4A – Data Source

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

4A – Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

4A – Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4A – Indicator Data

4A – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

4A – Targets

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

4A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated

intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

4A – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

4A – Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

4A – If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

18

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	136	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

4A – Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

4A – State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2019 (school year (SY) 2019–2020) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days was 0.113%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 5.113% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days was flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator of a suspension rate for the LEA to be flagged. Of the 154 LEAs in SY 2019-2020, 136 met the minimum "n" size of 30. Of the 18 that did not meet the minimum "n" size, all but one had a 0% suspension rate. Across the entire state, 91 students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2019-2020.

4A – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 4 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and State needs for consistency. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

COVID-19 does not appear to have had an impact on LEA rates of suspensions and expulsions exceeding 10 days as measured by Indicator 4A.

4A – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

4A – Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No LEAs were flagged for significant discrepancy. Review of policies, procedures, and practices was not required in FFY 2019 related to Indicator 4A.

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

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4A – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A – OSEP Response

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

4A – Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

4B – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

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

4B – Data Source

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

4B – Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

4B – Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race

and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B – Indicator Data

4B – Not Applicable

4B – Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

4B – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

4B – Targets

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

4B – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

4B – Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

4B – If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

27

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	127	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

4B – Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

4B – State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2019 (school year (SY) 2019-2020) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among local education agencies (LEAs) in the State for more than ten days was 0.113%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any LEA that suspended or expelled 5.113% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days was flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in at least one racial/ethnic group in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged. Of the 154 LEAs in SY 2019-2020, 127 met the minimum “n” size of 30.

4B – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 4 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and State needs for consistency. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

COVID-19 does not appear to have had an impact on LEA rates of suspensions and expulsions exceeding 10 days as measured by Indicator 4B.

In FFY 2019 and 2020, the USBE did not issue any findings of noncompliance to LEAs for Indicator 4B. LEAs flagged for potential significant discrepancy were provided a letter of identification from the USBE requiring the LEAs to conduct a review of internal policies, procedures, and practices. The LEAs were also required to review files for the students included in the flagged group(s). The LEAs provided the USBE with justification letters explaining the results of their internal reviews including specifics regarding the students in the flagged group(s). If noncompliance was identified in policies, procedures, or practices, the LEA would have been issued a finding of noncompliance. The finding would have identified specific regulations and required the LEA to revise policies, procedures, and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (34 CFR § 300.170; USBE Special Education Rules VIII.M.).

Although the USBE considers LEAs substantially compliant when the data indicates a very high level of compliance (generally 95% or above), the USBE accounts for all noncompliance and ensures 100% correction of all noncompliance. If the USBE had found any noncompliance for this indicator, within one year of identification, all corrections would have been verified through individual student files to ensure 100% compliance and a USBE review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices. Systemic understanding would have been verified through a review of additional student files.

The USBE has worked directly with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to improve and update the Indicator 4 process. We will be piloting a comprehensive self-assessment in 2022-2023. This process will increase the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate.

4B – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

4B – Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No LEAs were flagged for significant discrepancy. Review of policies, procedures, and practices was not required in FFY 2019 related to Indicator 4B.

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

4B – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

4B – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4B – Prior FFY Required Actions

In reporting its FFY 2020 data in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must clarify whether, in circumstances where the State is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, findings are issued to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified.

4B – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

4B – OSEP Response

4B – Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 [kindergarten] – 21)

5 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

5 – Data Source

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

5 – Measurement

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

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

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

5 – Instructions

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

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

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

5 – Indicator Data

5 – Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	65.12%
B	2018	9.71%
C	2018	2.67%

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	57.66%	58.09%	58.53%	58.97%	59.41%
A	Data	60.45%	61.57%	63.47%	65.12%	67.84%
B	Target <=	13.43%	13.36%	13.29%	13.22%	13.15%
B	Data	11.37%	10.68%	10.26%	9.71%	9.13%
C	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
C	Data	2.49%	2.61%	2.63%	2.67%	2.58%

5 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	65.12%	65.12%	65.79%	66.47%	67.81%	70.50%
Target B <=	9.71%	9.71%	9.43%	9.16%	8.61%	7.50%
Target C <=	2.78%	2.78%	2.77%	2.75%	2.68%	2.65%

5 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the

advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

5 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	78,739
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	55,542
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,640
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,974
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	24
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	115

5 – 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

5 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	55,542	78,739	67.84%	65.12%	70.54%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,640	78,739	9.13%	9.71%	8.43%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/ hospital placements *[c1+c2+c3]*	2,113	78,739	2.58%	2.78%	2.68%	Met target	No Slippage

5 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 5 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

The data between 2018 and 2020 for 5A shows over a 5% increase of students inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. This increase is outside of the trend and is believed to be due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. With the numbers reported, and the continual movement between virtual, in-person, and hybrid instruction during 2020, it is possible that IEP services and

supports were interrupted and/or changed to serve students with disabilities and accommodate shortened instructional time for all students within the LEA. There is also evidence to support students accessing general education settings at higher rates due to changing instructional practices and strategies that were implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, the data for both 5B and 5C show statistically significant changes that are inconsistent with previous trend data and are most likely impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In analyzing the data and the support requested from LEAs regarding serving students with more severe and complex disabilities, we identified a trend indicating these groups of students were moving in and out of the educational environment and service delivery models more frequently than students outside of these groups. The targets for Indicator 5 are different than what was reported in 2018 because we included the age 5 kindergartners for the current baseline to ensure the data was accurate in reporting, whereas age 5 kindergartners were not included in 2018.

5 – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not revise the baseline for this indicator, as required due to the change in the data source. The State must revise its baseline using data from FFY 2019.

5 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

5 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using recalculated data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

5 – Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

6 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

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

6 – Data Source

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

6 – Measurement

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

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

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

6 – Instructions

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

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

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

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

receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

6 – Indicator Data

6 – Not Applicable

6 – Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

6A, 6B – Historical Data

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	33.42%	33.62%	33.82%	36.32%	36.52%
A	Data	35.37%	37.19%	39.90%	48.09%	52.05%
B	Target <=	43.36%	43.16%	42.96%	41.35%	41.15%
B	Data	40.95%	38.36%	34.68%	28.50%	29.76%

6 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a

given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

6 – Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	46.86%
B	2018	32.67%
C	2018	0.25%

6A, 6B – Inclusive Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	46.86%	46.86%	47.75%	48.65%	50.43%	54.00%
Target B <=	32.67%	32.67%	32.34%	32.00%	31.34%	30.00%

6C – Inclusive Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.31%	0.31%	0.30%	0.29%	0.28%	0.24%

6 – Prepopulated Data

6 – Data Source:

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

6 – Data Source Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 – Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,395	3,730	1,026	7,151

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 – Total
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,152	1,946	527	3,625
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	803	998	287	2,088
b2. Number of children attending separate school	48	68	23	139
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	5	12	5	22

6 – 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

6 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data – Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,625	7,151	52.05%	46.86%	50.69%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,227	7,151	29.76%	32.67%	31.14%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	22	7,151	N/A	0.31%	0.31%	Met target	N/A

6 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline data is reflective of measurement with the exclusion of five-year-old students in kindergarten since they are now included in Indicator 5. It is different than the data outlined in

the historical data which was based on the measurement including five-year-old students in kindergarten.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 6 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and changes in the students being reported. Stakeholders reviewed historical data excluding five-year-old kindergartners and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

Indicator 6 data were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in FFY 2020. The overall number of students with disabilities ages 3–5 served in LEA preschool programs dropped from previous years. Additionally, fewer students without disabilities attended regular early childhood programs which impacted the percentage of students with disabilities receiving services in the regular early childhood program. A regular early childhood program is defined as a program where the majority (at least 50%) of students are without disabilities. A separate class is defined as a special education classroom that includes a majority (at least 50%) of students with disabilities. Since fewer students without disabilities attended LEA preschool programs, more students with disabilities received special education services in a separate class rather than in a regular early childhood program.

6 – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not revise the baseline for this indicator, as required due to the change in the data source. The State must revise its baseline using data from FFY 2019.

6 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

6 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for indicator 6A and indicator 6B using recalculated data, which includes five year old students in kindergarten, from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State established baseline for indicator 6C using recalculated data from FFY 2018, which includes five year old students in kindergarten, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

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

6 – Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

7 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

7 – Data Source

State selected data source.

7 – Measurement

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

7 – Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

7– Instructions

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

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

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

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

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

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

7 – Indicator Data

7 – Not Applicable

7 – Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

7 – Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A1	2018	88.86%
A2	2018	58.94%
B1	2018	88.41%
B2	2018	50.48%
C1	2018	86.86%
C2	2018	70.52%

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	Target >=	90.92%	91.12%	91.32%	95.10%	95.30%
A1	Data	88.21%	87.97%	89.28%	88.86%	89.18%
A2	Target >=	51.60%	51.80%	52.00%	52.93%	53.13%
A2	Data	59.03%	59.41%	61.26%	58.94%	57.20%
B1	Target >=	90.36%	90.56%	90.76%	93.21%	93.41%
B1	Data	87.21%	86.93%	88.34%	88.41%	90.04%
B2	Target >=	45.19%	45.39%	45.59%	48.71%	48.91%
B2	Data	52.69%	51.79%	53.64%	50.48%	48.70%
C1	Target >=	91.10%	91.30%	91.50%	93.92%	94.12%
C1	Data	88.98%	88.87%	90.83%	89.86%	89.68%
C2	Target >=	63.37%	63.57%	63.77%	67.21%	67.41%
C2	Data	71.43%	71.57%	71.68%	70.52%	66.95%

7 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	88.86%	88.86%	88.94%	89.02%	89.18%	89.50%
Target A2 >=	55.80%	55.80%	56.33%	56.85%	57.90%	60.00%
Target B1 >=	88.41%	88.41%	88.73%	89.06%	89.71%	91.00%
Target B2 >=	48.48%	48.48%	48.80%	49.11%	49.74%	51.00%
Target C1 >=	89.86%	89.86%	90.00%	90.15%	90.43%	91.00%
Target C2 >=	66.44%	66.44%	67.01%	67.58%	68.72%	71.00%

7 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE

shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1

During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19

pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

7 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

7 – Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,590

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	0.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	268	7.47%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,239	34.51%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,718	47.86%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	358	9.97%

Outcome A	Num-erator	Denom-inator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	2,957	3,232	89.18%	88.86%	91.49%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	2,076	3,590	57.20%	55.80%	57.83%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	9	0.25%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	260	7.24%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,531	42.65%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,674	46.63%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	116	3.23%

Outcome B	Num-erator	Denom-inator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	3,205	3,474	90.04%	88.41%	92.26%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	1,790	3,590	48.70%	48.48%	49.86%	Met target	No Slippage

7 – Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	0.39%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	230	6.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	889	24.76%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,006	55.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	451	12.56%

Outcome C	Num-erator	Denom-inator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	2,895	3,139	89.68%	89.86%	92.23%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	2,457	3,590	66.95%	66.44%	68.44%	Met target	No Slippage

7 – Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Data is collected in the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) online program. LEAs and the USBE can generate reports on the compliance data collected. These data and reports are used in the UPIPS onsite monitoring process as well as the APR. UPIPS has an assigned section titled Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) for collecting Indicator 7 early childhood outcomes data. Teachers collect and enter entry and exit outcome scores, along with the name of the assessment tool utilized, into UPOD when a student enters preschool and when the student exits preschool services, such as when the student transitions from preschool to kindergarten. The LEA report section provides LEA-specific 37 Part B early childhood outcomes data as well as overall statewide early childhood outcomes data with "n" sizes and percentages that are transferred to the APR.

7 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 7 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

The USBE predicts outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, and (C2) 70.52%, targets increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7 outcomes were impacted by the continued impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although most LEAs provided classes and services in-person, some students opted for services in a virtual model. Collecting entry and exit data for these students was challenging. Collection was only possible through remote means and some families disconnected because of difficulties accessing consistent broadband and because they were overwhelmed with health, safety, and school-at-home concerns.

7 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

7 – Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

8 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

8 – Data Source

State selected data source.

8 – Measurement

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

8 – Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 – Indicator Data

Data Collection Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

8 –Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six

years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The

USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

8 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	78.38%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	79.52%	79.52%	79.62%	80.52%	81.33%
Data	79.52%	76.82%	79.65%	78.38%	78.84%

8 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.38%	78.38%	78.58%	78.79%	79.19%	80.00%

8 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,821	2,318	78.84%	78.38%	78.56%	Met target	No Slippage

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

LEAs provide the USBE with contact information for all students with disabilities that are on the LEA's student list. The parent survey sample is based on the number of students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA. Parents who receive the survey are based on a statistical sampling of the LEA. The contact information provided by the LEA is sorted based on student grade, least restrictive environment code, and disability category. The sorted data is used to gather a representative sample of the LEA. The student data sorting procedure ensures that parents from all student groups are represented in the sample. All parents receive the same survey. Parents do not report whether their student is a preschool or a school age student. Survey collection procedures ensure both preschool and school age students are represented in an equitable

way. Please refer to the “Sampling Question” section below for additional discussion on how the USBE’s data collection procedures ensure equitable representation among preschool and school age students. Once the surveys are completed for all LEAs in the survey sample, the data is aggregated to determine the state rate for Indicator 8. The USBE uses the expertise of a statistician to aggregate the data and increase the validity and reliability of the data.

8 – The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

7,265

8 – Percentage of respondent parents

31.91%

8 – Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	26.05%	31.91%

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

Our overall response rate of 31.91% is quite high. This represents an increase from the 2019–2020 response rate of 26.05%. Even though results are representative for the state, we are taking steps to encourage more responses. To increase access to the survey, the USBE had a third party translate the survey and accompanying introduction letter into Vietnamese, Tongan, Farsi, Arabic, and Somali – the most common languages spoken in the state beyond English and Spanish. One LEA also requested translation of the survey into Marshallese as several parents in the LEA speak Marshallese as a primary language. This was approved and completed. Additionally, this was the second year the survey had a digital option for families who provided an email address and whose primary language was either English and/or Spanish. LEA Special Education Directors stated the digital survey provided additional access to families, contributing to an increase in returned surveys in both English and Spanish.

The first mailing of the paper surveys included the following languages and quantities: English (1220), Spanish (100), Arabic (4), Farsi (1), Somali (3), Tongan (2), Vietnamese (1), Marshallese (6 - introductory letter was sent in English and will be sent in Marshallese in the future. The letter was not translated in time for distribution). The online survey was sent in English (5619) and Spanish (381). The second mailing of the parent surveys included the following languages and quantities: English (4654), Spanish (419), Arabic (4), Farsi (1), Somali (3), Tongan (2), Vietnamese (1), Marshallese (3 - Parent letter was sent in English).

The USBE works proactively with families, organizations, and LEAs to provide technical assistance and support to ensure parents are involved in their student’s education and LEAs are compliant with parental involvement/engagement as set forth in the IDEA. Parent involvement is a cornerstone of the IDEA and Utah is a state that values and honors parent rights. Parent involvement is a priority area addressed through multiple aspects of the USBE's general supervision obligation.

The USBE's monitoring process (UPIPS) has placed an emphasis on parent engagement through parent and student focus groups and focused parent engagement questions in interviews with various educators, administrators, and related service providers. LEAs are provided verbal and written feedback and recommendations for improving parent involvement as part of the monitoring process.

The USBE is working on creating system coherence regarding parent involvement by building this priority area into the program improvement plan (PIP) process. Each LEA is required to develop a PIP on an annual basis. The LEA must conduct a data analysis and root cause analysis around parent involvement to identify areas of strength and areas of need. LEAs are required to develop goals for parent involvement in their plan if they were identified as having high risk for Indicator 8. As the PIP is reviewed and revised each year, the LEA must also report progress on previous year's goals.

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

Utah used statistical significance testing to determine if one demographic group was over- or under-represented based on their response rate. Although significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and disability, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed no significant differences in the overall parent involvement percentage.

Utah also compared the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no difference between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later.

Based on our analysis, we conclude that nonresponse bias is not present.

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

Utah used statistical significance testing of response rated to determine if one demographic group was over-or under-represented. Note that our survey sample was such that if all disaggregated groups have the same response rate, then, the disaggregated groups are representative of the population. For example, if all racial/ethnic groups had a 30% response rate, the population of the respondents would mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. On the other hand, if one racial/ethnic group had a 30% response rate and another had a 20% response rate, the population of the respondents would not mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. Significant differences were found in response rates by disability and race/ethnicity. In terms of race/ethnicity, parents of White students were more likely to respond (response rate=35.21%) than parents of American Indian

students (response rate=21.69%) and Hispanic students (response rate=20.94%). In terms of disability, parents of students with Autism (response rate=38.96%) and parents of students with Other Health Impairments (response rate=37.23%) were more likely to respond than parents of students with a Specific Learning Disability (response rate=28.10%). No significant differences were found by the grade of the student.

Although there are a few significant differences in response rates between groups of parents by race/ethnicity and disability, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage between the different groups of parents. For example, parents of White students had a similar parent involvement percentage as parents of Hispanic students and parents of American Indian students. So, we are confident that the overall results are representative of the State despite the differences in response rates. In addition, parents from a wide range of LEAs across the state responded to the survey. Thus, the results are representative of all racial/ethnic groups and all disability categories. Furthermore, results are weighted by LEA to ensure the parent survey results reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution.

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

NO

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

The strategies USBE will use to ensure future response data are representative of the demographics of the students receiving special education services are described above in the "Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented" field.

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

Statistical significance testing of response rate was used to determine representativeness with a threshold of $p<0.05$.

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

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

All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving the parent survey on a biennial basis. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive the survey every year. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. LEAs across the stratified categories were then randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. Each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs.

For each LEA, a stratified, representative group of parents is selected to receive the parent survey. The number of parents chosen is dependent on the number of students with disabilities in the LEA. The sample sizes selected ensure roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes.

For those LEAs that have more than 100 students, a sample of parents was chosen to receive the survey. The population was stratified by grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample. When calculating state-level results, responses were weighted by the student population size (e.g., an LEA that had four times as many students with disabilities as another LEA received four times the weight in computing overall state results). The number of respondents who reported the school facilitated parent involvement and the total number of respondents are not whole numbers because weighting data often results in fractional weights.

The parent survey is based on a Likert scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The maximum rating is 100% when a parent responds “strongly agree" on all questions. A 67% rating is when a parent responds “agree” on all questions, a 33% rating is when a parent responds “disagree” on all questions, and a 0% rating is when a parent responds “strongly disagree" on all questions. If a parent survey rating is 67% or higher, the survey has met the minimum threshold for Indicator 8. If a parent responds “strongly disagree” on any item, the survey has not met the indicator requirements.

The USBE mails or emails a survey introduction letter, a survey, and a business reply envelope (for parents to submit completed mailed surveys) to every parent on the LEA’s determined sample list. All surveys are sent out no later than the middle of March. Surveys are expected to be returned within one month. Any parents who have not returned the surveys within the first month are provided bi-weekly reminders and are offered additional options for responding to the survey until the LEA reaches the desired response rate or until the survey closes.

The USBE made the survey available in a digital format for the second time this year. The digital version of the survey was sent out to all parents who provided their email addresses and whose primary language was Spanish and/or English. Digital surveys were completed through Qualtrics. Qualtrics produces a spreadsheet of parent answers.

When the paper and pen survey is completed, it is scanned and processed with an Optical Mark Reader (OMR) software program. The software program helps eliminate human error during the scoring process. The program produces a spreadsheet of the parent answers. The OMR and Qualtrics survey data are merged into one spreadsheet which is securely provided to the USBE’s statistician who produces the state report.

As requested, the sampling plan is attached.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	Not new or revised

8 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 8 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

The USBE has no reason to suspect the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on the positivity of the survey responses. Both paper and digital response options were offered before and during the pandemic.

8 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

In its description of its FFY 2020 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. Specifically, the State indicated that the data are "representative for the state", which is inconsistent with the required measurement.

The State submitted a sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

8 – Required Actions

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

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

9 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

9 – Data Source

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

9 – Measurement

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

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

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

9 – Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

9 – Indicator Data

9 – Not Applicable

9 – Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

9 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	0.00%

9 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

9 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

35

Number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	121	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

9 – Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as a final risk ratio of 3.00 or above. For Indicator 9, 156 LEAs were included in the analysis for school year (SY) 2020–2021. Of these 156 LEAs, 121 LEAs met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final risk ratio.

Using SY 2020–2021 data, the USBE calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group in each LEA in the State based on the identification rate of every group in each LEA. Each LEA's highest weighted risk ratio became the final risk ratio if, in the target group, there were 10 or more students with disabilities (cell size) and 30 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA, and if, in the comparison group, there were also 10 or more students with disabilities (cell size) and 30 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA.

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

For SY 2020–2021, one LEA was flagged as having a final risk ratio above 3.00. A review was conducted by the State to verify there was no disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process. This included student record reviews and evaluation and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. The LEA was required to conduct an internal review of student data as well as LEA policies, procedures, and practices. The LEA was required to submit a letter to the State including justification for the identified students (Rules VIII.I.7.). No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in the LEA based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in 34 CFR § 300.600(d)(3).

9 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2019 and 2020, the USBE did not issue any findings of noncompliance to LEAs for Indicator 9. LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation were provided a letter of identification from the USBE requiring the LEAs to conduct a review of internal policies, procedures, and practices. The LEAs were also required to review files for the students included in the flagged group(s). The LEAs provided the USBE with justification letters explaining the results of their internal reviews including specifics regarding the students in the flagged group(s). If noncompliance was discovered in policies, procedures, or practices, the LEA would have been issued a finding of noncompliance. The finding would have identified specific regulations and required the LEA to revise policies, procedures, and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (34 CFR § 300.173; USBE Special Education Rules VIII.B.12.).

Although the USBE considers LEAs substantially compliant when the data indicates a very high level of compliance (generally 95% or above), the USBE accounts for all noncompliance and ensures 100% correction of all noncompliance. If the USBE had found any noncompliance for this indicator, within one year of identification, all corrections would have been verified through individual student files to ensure 100% compliance and a USBE review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices. Systemic understanding would have been verified through a review of additional student files.

The USBE has worked directly with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to improve and update the Indicator 9 process. We will be piloting a comprehensive self-assessment in 2022–2023. This process will increase the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 9 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and State needs for consistency. Stakeholders reviewed

historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2526 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

COVID-19 does not appear to have impacted the data for Indicator 9 even though some LEAs had hybrid and remote learning.

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

9 – Prior FFY Required Actions

In reporting its FFY 2020 data in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must clarify whether the State, in circumstances where it is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, issues findings to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified.

9 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

9 – OSEP Response

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

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to clarify in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR whether, in circumstances where the State is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, findings are issued to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified. The State provided none of the required information.

9 – Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must clarify whether, in circumstances where the State is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, findings are issued to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

10 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

10 – Data Source

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

10 – Measurement

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

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

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

10 – Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments,

and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

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

10 – Indicator Data

10 – Not Applicable

10 – Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

10 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	0.00%

10 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

10 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

80

Number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
7	0	76	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

10 – Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as a final risk ratio of 3.00 or above. For Indicator 10, 156 LEAs were included in the analysis for school year (SY) 2020–2021. Of these 156 LEAs, 76 LEAs met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final risk ratio.

Using SY 2020–2021 data, the USBE calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group and disability category combination in each LEA in the State based on identification rates in each LEA. (For each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated—one for each of the seven

racial/ethnic groups times the six primary disability categories.) Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students with a particular disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. Each LEA's highest weighted risk ratio became the final risk ratio if, in the target group, there were 10 or more students with disabilities (cell size) and 30 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA, and if, in the comparison group, there were also 10 or more students with disabilities (cell size) and 30 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA.

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

For SY 2020–2021, seven LEAs were flagged as having a final risk ratio above 3.00. A review was conducted by the State to verify there was no disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) monitoring data were also reviewed during this process. This included reviews of student records and evaluation and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. Each identified LEA was required to conduct an internal review of student data as well as LEA policies, procedures, and practices. They were required to submit a letter to the State including justification for the identified students (Rules VIII.I.7.). No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in these LEAs based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in 34 CFR § 300.600(d)(3).

10 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2019 and 2020, the USBE did not issue any findings of noncompliance to LEAs for Indicator 10. LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation were provided a letter of identification from the USBE requiring the LEAs to conduct a review of internal policies, procedures, and practices. The LEAs were also required to review files for the students included in the flagged group(s). The LEAs provided the USBE with justification letters explaining the results of their internal reviews including specifics regarding the students in the flagged group(s). If noncompliance was discovered in policies, procedures, or practices, the LEA would have been issued a finding of noncompliance. The finding would have identified specific regulations and required the LEA to revise policies, procedures, and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (34 CFR § 300.173; USBE Special Education Rules VIII.B.12.).

Although the USBE considers LEAs substantially compliant when the data indicates a very high level of compliance (generally 95% or above), the USBE accounts for all noncompliance and ensures 100% correction of all noncompliance. If the USBE had found any noncompliance for this indicator, within one year of identification, all corrections would have been verified through individual student files to ensure 100% compliance and a USBE review of LEA policies,

procedures, and practices. Systemic understanding would have been verified through a review of additional student files.

The USBE has worked directly with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to improve and update the Indicator 10 process. We will be piloting a comprehensive self-assessment in 2022-2023. This process will increase the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 10 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and State needs for consistency. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

COVID-19 does not appear to have impacted the data for Indicator 10 even though some LEAs had hybrid and remote learning.

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

10 – Prior FFY Required Actions

In reporting its FFY 2020 data in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must clarify whether the State, in circumstances where it is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, issues findings to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified.

10 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

10 – OSEP Response

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

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to clarify in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR whether, in circumstances where the State is unable to verify correction of

noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, findings are issued to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified. The State provided none of the required information.

10 – Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must clarify whether, in circumstances where the State is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, findings are issued to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified.

Indicator 11: Child Find

11 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

11 – Data Source

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

11 – Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

11 – Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently

corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

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

11 – Indicator Data

11 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	96.21%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Data	99.28%	99.60%	100.00%	96.21%	97.10%

11 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

11 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
782	762	97.10%	100.00%	97.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

11 – Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

20

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

Twenty student files across eight LEAs had initial evaluations completed beyond the State-established timeline of 45 school days without a compliant reason for delay as defined by Utah Special Education Rules II.D.3. (e.g., repeated failure to produce the student, enrolling in the school after the timeframe has begun, etc.). These files were determined These evaluations were noncompliant at the time of the review.

The USBE reviewed 782 special education files across 79 LEAs. Of the 782 evaluations completed, 10 student files across nine LEAs had initial evaluations completed after the 45-day time period but had a compliant reason for delay documented in the file in accordance with Rule II.D.3. and are included in the 762 count of compliant files.

11 – Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

11 – What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rule II.D. states the initial evaluation must be conducted within 45 school days of receiving parental or adult student consent for the evaluation.

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

State monitoring

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

Data for Indicator 11 was collected through onsite full monitoring visits and through file reviews focused on initial evaluation compliance and entered in the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) online program. During school year (SY) 2020–2021, 79 LEAs provided 782 files with data regarding initial evaluations conducted in the current or previous school year. Of the 782 files reviewed, 762 (97.44%) met State requirements.

The USBE utilizes UPIPS to monitor and support compliance with federal and state requirements in LEAs across the state of Utah. UPIPS is based on the concept that monitoring is a continuous process to improve procedural compliance and outcomes for students with disabilities. UPIPS includes an RDA process to review LEA performance on APR indicators and State requirements as established (e.g., APR indicators, timeliness of data and fiscal reports, the LEA program improvement plan (PIP), use of internal monitoring for compliance, etc.). LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators, based on their data in each area. The risk range is one through five, with a five designating high risk. LEAs are given a risk score of five for Indicator 11 if the compliance is ten percentage points or more below the State target. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a program implementation monitoring tier (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, or Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities (including monitoring) for each LEA based on their identified tiers. LEAs who are in the coaching and directing tiers receive a full monitoring visit that will include a review of Indicator 11 data as part of the comprehensive review. Full monitoring visits may also be triggered by dispute resolution or through other general supervision systems. During the visit, the LEA is encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive technical assistance during the

review process and all Indicator 11 data that comes from a full monitoring visit is included in the APR.

In addition to full monitoring visits, the USBE collects Indicator 11 data through file reviews focused on initial evaluation timeline compliance. Most of the Indicator 11 data is gathered through these reviews because a larger number of LEAs are included. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving an Indicator 11 file review on a biennial basis. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive an Indicator 11 file review annually. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. LEAs across the stratified categories were then randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. Each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs. The rotation for the Indicator 11 review is on an alternating schedule with the Indicator 8 parent survey. In years the first cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey, the second cohort receives an Indicator 11 file review. In years the first cohort receives an Indicator 11 file review, the second cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey. COVID-19 was still impacting Utah LEAs in the fall of 2020, and two Indicator 11 reviews on the original schedule were cancelled. Due to increasing COVID-19 infection rates, Utah LEAs were concerned about physical contact with outside people. In response, the USBE pivoted the data collection method used to collect the Indicator 11 data. Previously conducted in-person, reviews were shifted to a virtual format to eliminate the need for USBE reviewers coming in physical contact with LEAs. To support LEAs with the shift to the virtual format, the number of files reviewed for each LEA was reduced from 15 files to 10 during SY 2020–2021.

LEAs were provided six weeks (Prong 1) to correct noncompliance before being issued any findings of noncompliance. Although the USBE considers LEAs to be substantially compliant when the data indicate a very high level of compliance (generally 95% or above), if an LEA was below 100% compliant on any of the areas outlined in the APR Measurement Table for Indicator 11 at the end of Prong 1, a finding of noncompliance was issued consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. A finding is a written notification from the USBE to an LEA containing the State's conclusion the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible following the Prong 1 correction window and within less than three months. USBE ensures that all instances of noncompliance are corrected within one year whether written findings were issued or not.

Individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and USBE Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding (I.e., General Supervision, FAPE in the LRE, Parent Involvement, Transition, Disproportionality). If an LEA is noncompliant with Indicator 11, a finding is issued for General Supervision with a citation of 34 CFR §300.301 for the initial evaluation. If the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement, the LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance issued for the same time period.

Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification. Once non-compliance has been identified, the LEAs must correct each instance of noncompliance by showing an alternate student file for the same case manager

that was completed within the 45-school-day timeline. LEAs with findings of noncompliance are also required to provide additional files for compliance review, document additional professional learning on the regulatory requirements, and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrate correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (OSEP Memo 09-02).

11 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 11 results were impacted by the lack of in-person schooling options during the pandemic. LEAs made a variety of efforts to conduct assessments and hold required meetings within the timelines. Technology was used widely and continues to be used where appropriate. In-person assessments were conducted when required to glean accurate data as outlined by assessment publishers. In-person assessments followed protocols as outlined by the USBE and the Utah Department of Health.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 11 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19 and the requirement to report identified noncompliance to OSEP. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

During SY 2017–2018, 372 files were reviewed. During SY 2018–2019, the number of files reviewed increased by over 300% to 1,215. During SY 2019–2020, the global pandemic began impacting LEAs in March of 2020 which reduced the number of files reviewed to 620. During SY 2020–2021, the number of files being reviewed was reduced to 10 files per LEA, resulting in 782 special education files reviewed.

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

11 – FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All LEAs with a level of compliance below 100% on any of the areas outlined in the APR Measurement Table for Indicator 11 at the time of the review were required to show an understanding of the 45-school-day timeline by producing a file from the same case manager for an alternate student that was completed within the timeline. The USBE reviewed the file for the alternate student and confirmed 100% compliance. As noted in the fourth paragraph of the description of the method used to collect these data, LEAs were provided six weeks to provide a

compliant file to show understanding (Prong 1). One LEA still had a level of compliance below 100% at the end of Prong 1 and was issued a finding. This LEA was required to provide two additional files that were completed within the 45-school-day timeline. The USBE reviewed these additional files and confirmed 100% compliance. The USBE also conducted two hours of training on timelines and eligibility requirements with all the special education staff in this LEA.

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

The USBE verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through reviewing additional files from the same case managers that were completed within the 45-school-day timeline. The USBE also verified all initial evaluations completed beyond the timeline were completed.

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

11 – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified during the April 2021 clarification period, based on FFY 2019 data, for this indicator.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

11 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. In its narrative, the State reported "[t]he USBE verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through reviewing additional files from the same case managers that were completed within the 45-school-day timeline. The USBE also verified all initial evaluations completed beyond the timeline were completed". However, OSEP is unable to determine whether USBE verified that the noncompliance was corrected for each child that was originally identified as not having an initial evaluation completed within the 45-school-day timeline.

11 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the LEA corrected the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and verified correction of that finding, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and the one LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

12 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

12 – Data Source

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

12 – Measurement

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

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

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

12 – Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

12 – Indicator Data

12 – Not Applicable

12 – Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

12 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	99.62%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Data	99.90%	99.74%	99.84%	99.62%	94.08%

12 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

12 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Measurement	Data
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,314
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	417
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,693

Measurement	Data
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	102
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	27
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,693	1,768	94.08%	100.00%	95.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

75

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

For 51 of the 75 students included only in (a), the IEP was completed after the students' third birthdays due to LEAs being unable to complete eligibility assessments because of COVID-19 school closures. When possible, transition meetings were held remotely to discuss assessment procedures with families. Part C assessment data was considered for Part B eligibility if the assessment data met Part B criteria and was current. For these students, assessments were completed when the USBE and LEA deemed it safe to complete assessments in-person. All IEPs impacted by the COVID-19 school closures have been completed.

Twelve students were referred to Part B for eligibility determination, were determined not eligible after their third birthday, and no IEP was developed.

The remaining 12 delays were not attributed to the COVID-19 school closures and are outlined below:

- LEA 1: Four IEPs were completed late due to the need for additional testing. The range of days beyond the third birthday for these four IEPs was 17 to 74 days. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided technical assistance on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 2: One IEP was completed late due to the student having a birthday in the summer when the LEA was not in session. This IEP was completed 59 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided technical assistance on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 3: One IEP was late due to the need for additional testing. The LEA is developing a list of assessments for multilingual students to ensure timely IEPs in the future, rather than relying on classroom observation for determining eligibility. Two other IEPs were late due to staff missing timelines. The range of days beyond the third birthday for these three IEPs was three to 88 days. The LEA Preschool Coordinator provided training to all preschool staff regarding timelines. The coordinator also implemented a new color-coded folder system to ensure IEPs are completed on time for students transitioning from Part C.
- LEA 4: One IEP was completed late due to the student having a birthday in the summer when the LEA was not in session. This IEP was completed 51 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided technical assistance on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 5: One IEP was completed late due to the student having a birthday in the summer when the LEA was not in session. This IEP was completed 16 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided technical assistance on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 6: One IEP was late due to the need for additional testing. Another IEP was late due to the student not participating in the assessment. The assessment team had to schedule an additional testing session to complete eligibility. The range of days beyond the third birthday for these two IEPs was 70 to 77 days. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided technical assistance on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The statewide database, Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI), has been fully operational since FFY 2009. TEDI accesses the Part C statewide database daily to obtain a list of all students that meet four criteria: 1) student is 27 months old, 2) has not opted out, 3) is actively enrolled, and 4) is considered potentially eligible for Part B. Student data is transferred to TEDI with student demographic information. As the Part C database transfers a student into TEDI, TEDI then accesses the USBE's Statewide Student Identifier Database (SSID) to provide that student with a unique identification number that will continue with that student throughout the

student's public education experience in Utah. To ensure confidentiality, individual student-level data are only available to school personnel with the appropriate permissions within TEDI.

TEDI provides an up-to-date status of the Part C to Part B Transition meeting, the date of the student's third birthday, and whether the student was found eligible or not eligible. The Part C database and the Part B database (TEDI) share data back and forth daily. Before a student's file can be closed out in Part C, the provider is required to reconcile data from TEDI to ensure the exit reason is accurately recorded for each student that has been referred to Part B.

TEDI provides the USBE and the LEAs with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Part B. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2021. In the process of reviewing LEA data on this Indicator, the USBE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memo. Noncompliance with timelines for Indicator 12 (34 CFR § 300.124) is identified during an annual review of the TEDI statewide database by the USBE and included with general supervision data.

12 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 12 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

Noncompliance identified for Indicator 12 is reported to OSEP upon identification. The LEA is notified as soon as possible of findings of noncompliance, and, in no case, longer than three months after discovery. LEAs are not provided an opportunity to correct the noncompliance before the finding is issued consistent with OSEP Guidance.

OSEP's response to the February 2022 submission stated an attachment on Indicator 12 was not 508 compliant. During the clarification call on 4/20/2022, OSEP representatives verified no attachments were included for Indicator 12.

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
128	128	0	0

12 – FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2019, 128 students were not evaluated for Part B prior to their third birthdays. Of those students, 126 were not evaluated due to school closures related to COVID-19. The remaining two

students were not evaluated due to noncompliant LEA policies. The USBE required the LEA policies be updated. The USBE Preschool Special Education Specialist has reviewed the updated policies and confirmed they are now compliant. The USBE Preschool Special Education Specialist also provided technical assistance to each LEA that was issued findings of noncompliance. Due to the school closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic, these sessions were completed virtually with LEA preschool leadership. Additionally, the USBE Preschool Special Education Specialist reviewed additional files in each identified LEA to ensure the regulatory requirements are being correctly implemented.

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

The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist reviewed the data in the TEDI system to verify each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure students were evaluated for special education eligibility as soon as possible, and, in no case later, than one year. All IEPs impacted by the spring/summer 2020 COVID-19 school closures were completed by the submission date of the FFY 2019 APR.

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

12 – Prior FFY Required Actions

In reporting its FFY 2020 data in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must clarify whether, in circumstances where the State is unable to verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 within the three-week window, findings are issued to LEAs regardless of the level of noncompliance identified.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

12 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

12 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018 and OSEP accepts that revision.

12 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and verified correction of those findings consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

13 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

13 – Data Source

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

13 – Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

13 – Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

13 – Indicator Data

13 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	69.13%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Data	92.41%	92.07%	88.40%	39.71%	52.10%

13 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

13 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
459	664	52.10%	100.00%	69.13%	N/A	N/A

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

State monitoring

13 – 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.

In 2016, the USBE lowered the transition planning age to 14. Data for Indicator 13 was collected through onsite full monitoring visits and through file reviews focused on transition compliance and entered in the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) online program. In school year (SY) 2020–2021, 68 LEAs provided 664 files with data for youth aged 14 and above with IEPs. Of the 664 files reviewed, 459 (69.13%) met state requirements. Sixty-three LEAs provided immediate corrections of noncompliance that were verified by USBE Staff within a six-week correction window. These LEAs were not issued any written findings of noncompliance. Five LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance in SY 2020–2021 because they were below 100% compliant in one or more required transition areas at the end of the six-week correction window.

USBE began reporting Indicator 13 data for students who were at least 14 years old at the time the IEP was written in the FFY 2019 APR. When looking at the data, it is important to recognize the USBE is reporting on a larger number of LEAs since the FFY 2019 APR and is gradually moving the needle with Indicator 13 compliance which is largely attributed to the intensified training and coaching efforts being made with Indicator 13.

The USBE utilizes UPIPS to monitor and support compliance with federal and state requirements in LEAs across Utah. UPIPS is based on the concept that monitoring is a continuous process to improve procedural compliance and outcomes for students with disabilities. UPIPS includes an RDA process to review LEA performance on APR Indicators and State requirements as established (e.g., APR Indicators, timeliness of data and fiscal reports, the LEA program improvement plan (PIP), use of internal monitoring for compliance, etc.). LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and Indicators based on their data in each area. The risk range is one through five, with five designating high risk. LEAs are given a risk score of five if the Indicator 13 compliance is ten percentage points or more below the State target. After risk scores have been determined, LEAs are assigned a program implementation monitoring tier (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, or Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities (including monitoring) for each LEA based on the level of identified need. LEAs who are in the coaching and directing tiers receive a full monitoring visit that will include a review of Indicator 13 data as part of the comprehensive review. Full monitoring visits may also be triggered by dispute resolution or through other general supervision systems. During the visit, the LEA is encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive technical assistance during the review process and all Indicator 13 data that comes from a full monitoring visit is included in the APR.

In addition to full monitoring visits, the USBE collects Indicator 13 data through file reviews focused on transition compliance. Most of the Indicator 13 data are gathered through these reviews because a larger number of LEAs are included. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving an Indicator 13 file review on a biennial basis. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive an Indicator 13 file review annually. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics,

and socioeconomic level. LEAs across the stratified categories were then randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. Each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs. The rotation for the Indicator 13 review is on an alternating schedule with the Indicator 8 parent survey. In years the first cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey, the second cohort receives an Indicator 13 file review. In years the first cohort receives an Indicator 13 file review, the second cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey. Due to the impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic on Utah LEAs, the USBE pivoted the data collection method used to Indicator 13 file reviews in SY 2020–2021. Previously conducted in-person, reviews were shifted to a virtual format to eliminate the need for USBE reviewers coming in physical contact with LEAs. To support LEAs with the shift to the virtual format, the number of files reviewed for each LEA was reduced from 20 files to 10 during SY 2020–2021.

LEAs were provided six weeks (Prong 1) to correct noncompliance before being issued any findings of noncompliance. The USBE considers LEAs substantially compliant, relative to each compliance Indicator, if the LEA data indicate a very high level of compliance (generally 95% or above) at the end of the Prong 1 correction window (OSEP Memo 09-02). If an LEA is below 100% compliant on any of the areas outlined in the APR Measurement Table for Indicator 13 at the end of Prong 1, a finding of noncompliance is issued. A finding is a written notification from the USBE to an LEA containing the State's conclusion the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible following the Prong 1 correction window and within less than three months. USBE ensures that all instances of noncompliance are corrected within one year whether written findings are issued or not.

Individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and USBE Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding (I.e., General Supervision, FAPE in the LRE, Parent Involvement, Transition, Disproportionality). If an LEA is noncompliant with Indicator 13, a finding is issued for Transition with a citation of each rule related to post-school transition in 34 CFR § 300.320-300.322 that demonstrated substantial noncompliance. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement.

Age Questions	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

13 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 13 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19, Utah's change to the student age requirements for transition planning, and OSEP's identification of noncompliance reporting requirements. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and

projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

Although USBE pivoted to a virtual format to collect the Indicator 13 data, the pivot did not interfere with USBE's interactions with LEAs during the reviews. Reviewers were still able to provide technical assistance as part of the virtual reviews in a similar way as was previously done through the in-person review process.

Following the February 2022 submission, the State identified a data reporting error in the State data system which impacted 27 student transition plans originally reported for indicator 13. These 27 student transition plans had indicated transition services were noncompliant when they actually were. Of these 27 transition plans, 13 plans met all Indicator 13 requirements at the time of the review, and 14 plans had other noncompliance identified. The State's FFY 2020 originally reported as 67.17% (446 compliant transition plans of 664 reviewed). The State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR has been updated to reflect 459 compliant transition plans of 664 reviewed, bringing the State's FFY 2020 data to 69.13%.

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

13 – FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In SY 2019–2020, 47 LEAs had files reviewed for Indicator 13 compliance. Each LEA was given a three-week window to make corrections and provide evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements. The USBE was able to verify correction of all levels of noncompliance and evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements within the three-week window in 44 LEAs. These LEAs were not issued findings of noncompliance.

Although the USBE considers LEAs substantially compliant when the data indicates a very high level of compliance (generally 95% or above), the USBE accounts for all noncompliance and ensures 100% correction of all noncompliance. Findings were issued to the three LEAs in which the USBE was unable to verify correction of all noncompliance and evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements within the three-week window for all transition requirements below 100% compliant consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the three LEAs that were issued findings, within one year of identification, the USBE verified evidence of correction provided by each LEA for all levels of noncompliance. The USBE also

reviewed additional files in each LEA to ensure correct implementation of regulatory requirements.

Targeted technical assistance continues to be provided to LEAs to achieve the target of 100%.

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

To correct noncompliance concerning transition plans, LEAs were required to submit documentation of corrected transition plans in the areas identified as noncompliant. If changes needed to be made for existing transition plans, correction was allowed to be made through the IEP amendment process. If a transition plan was not developed for a student who was 14 at the time the IEP was written, the amendment process was not allowed, and the IEP team was required to meet and develop a transition plan. Once corrections were made for items of identified noncompliance, LEAs notified the USBE of correction and correction was verified and approved by the USBE to finalize the correction and confirm 100% compliance.

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

13 – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified during the April 2021 clarification period, based on FFY 2019 data, for this indicator.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

13 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

13 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

13 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

14 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

14 – Data Source

State selected data source.

14 – Measurement

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

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

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

14 – Instructions

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

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

14 – I. Definitions

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

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

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

14 – II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

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

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

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

14 – III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 – Indicator Data

14 – Historical Data

Measure	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	19.62%
B	2018	67.60%
C	2018	84.37%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	26.00%	27.50%	28.25%	29.00%	29.75%
Data	19.35%	20.74%	20.24%	19.62%	19.39%
Target >=	72.67%	75.67%	78.67%	81.67%	85.07%
Data	64.63%	66.82%	68.77%	67.60%	60.56%
Target >=	87.83%	90.83%	93.83%	96.83%	99.83%
Data	79.46%	82.63%	84.32%	84.37%	83.37%

14 – FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	17.62%	17.62%	18.29%	18.97%	20.31%	23.00%
Target B >=	65.50%	65.50%	65.81%	66.13%	66.75%	68.00%
Target C >=	82.37%	82.37%	82.70%	83.03%	83.69%	85.00%

14 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees

- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in

meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

14 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Measurement	Data
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	4,810
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,427
Response Rate	50.46%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	434
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,157
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	212
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed)	207

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	434	2,427	19.39%	17.62%	17.88%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,591	2,427	60.56%	65.50%	65.55%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	2,010	2,427	83.37%	82.37%	82.82%	Met target	No Slippage

14 – Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

14 – Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	51.29%	50.46%

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

Opportunities have been presented to LEAs to increase their awareness and participation in conducting their own surveys to increase their response rates. Data matching is occurring with Adult Education which has increased the response rate for dropouts.

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

The metric of 3% or higher was used to determine underrepresentation. An analysis of the data does not indicate a nonresponse bias discrepancy, as there was a 1.8% underrepresentation of Hispanic and Latino students reflected in the survey responses. There was also no identified nonresponse bias with the dropout responses, which reflected a 3% underrepresentation in the survey.

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

The USBE had a 3% underrepresentation of students who dropped out of school in the 2020 APR survey data, an increase of 1% over the 2019 APR survey data. Demographic data were collected for race and ethnicity, but no group showed underrepresentation larger than 1.8%. There has been a decrease since 2018 when there was a 7% underrepresentation in the survey of students who dropped out, because of the adult education data matching.

The USBE is continually working to examine the root causes to implement strategies that will decrease disproportionality in the survey data. Additionally, The USBE is providing LEAs with strategies for contacting hard to find youth, as well as encouraging and training LEAs to conduct their own surveys rather than using USBE contracted interviewers. There has been an increase in response rates among those LEAs that have conducted their own surveys, especially for underrepresented populations. For this year's survey (FFY 2020), the USBE matched student exit data with adult education enrollment data to increase outcome data for those students who had dropped out and have enrolled in adult education for completion of a General Education Diploma (GED) or adult education diploma completion. This practice of adult education data matching has decreased the gap in the USBE's underrepresentation of survey data for students who dropped out.

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

NO

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

The USBE had a 3% underrepresentation of students who dropped out of school in the 2020 APR survey data, an increase of 1% over the 2019 APR survey data. Demographic data were collected for race and ethnicity, but no group showed underrepresentation larger than 1.8%. There has been a decrease since 2018 when there was a 7% underrepresentation in the survey of students who dropped out, because of the adult education data matching.

The USBE is continually working to examine the root causes to implement strategies that will decrease disproportionality in the survey data. Additionally, The USBE is providing LEAs with strategies for contacting hard to find youth, as well as encouraging and training LEAs to conduct their own surveys rather than using USBE contracted interviewers. There has been an increase in response rates among those LEAs that have conducted their own surveys, especially for underrepresented populations. For this year's survey (FFY 2020), the USBE matched student exit data with adult education enrollment data to increase outcome data for those students who had dropped out and have enrolled in adult education for completion of a GED or adult education diploma completion. This practice of adult education data matching has decreased the gap in the USBE's underrepresentation of survey data for students who dropped out.

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

The metric of 3% or higher was used to determine underrepresentation by the demographics list on the State Demographics Table.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

14 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 14 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

The impacts of COVID-19 were seen in 14B which are reflected in the FFY 2020 data. These impacts were less than in the FFY 2019 data. The targets are based on considerations of the baseline and current data including COVID-19 impacts. COVID-19 did not impact the completeness, accuracy, or timeliness of the survey and data matching.

14 – Prior FFY Required Actions

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

14 – Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

14 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

14 – Required Actions

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

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

15 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

15 – Data Source

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

15 – Measurement

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

15 – Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 – Indicator Data

15 – Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

15 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	8
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

15 – 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

15 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The

USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

15 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	44.44%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
Data	100.00%	0.00%	66.67%	44.44%	80.00%

15 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

15 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	8	80.00%	N/A	37.50%	N/A	N/A

15 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Utah held fewer than 10 resolution sessions in FFY 2020. Three of the eight resolution sessions were successfully resolved through settlement agreements. The other five resolution meetings involved a single family who filed multiple due process hearing requests. Based off previous years' data, the COVID-19 pandemic does not appear to have had an impact on the number of due process hearing requests, the number of resolution sessions, or the number of successful resolution sessions.

Due to Utah's consistently low number of resolution sessions, targets are not required.

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 15 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah trends in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

15 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

15 – Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

16 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

16 – Data Source

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

16 – Measurement

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

16 – Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 – Indicator Data

16 – Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

16 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	13
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	9

16 – 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

16 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The

USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

16 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	68.75%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	N/A	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	60.00%
Data	87.50%	100.00%	90.00%	68.75%	62.50%

16 – Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.25%	60.50%	60.75%	61.00%	61.25%	61.50%

16 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	9	13	62.50%	60.25%	84.62%	Met target	No Slippage

16 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the APR Summit, a review of baselines for Indicator 16 was conducted to determine if baselines should remain or be updated to correlate with changing targets. Consideration was given for the impacts of COVID-19. Stakeholders reviewed historical data and projections for where the State would be in 2025–206 if all things stayed the same. Choosing a baseline from a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah trends in a typical school year and was determined to be appropriate.

The USBE has a very low mediation rate, averaging fewer than eight mediation sessions per year over the past five years. In 2018, Utah had the second lowest total dispute resolution by State per 10,000 children. The USBE surveyed Indicator 16 targets and data for all 50 states and outlying territories. The USBE reviewed the 10 states with the lowest total dispute resolution by State per 10,000 children. A review of this data in conjunction with the USBE's mediation figures support the baseline data from 2018. Where factors are in the USBE's control (e.g., the retention and training of skilled, knowledgeable mediators, timely responses to requests for mediation, establishing communication among the parties, etc.), the USBE meets the high standards that it sets for itself. However, while the USBE strives to have every mediation result in a mediation agreement, there are many factors in any given mediation session that are outside of the USBE's control.

Based off previous years' data, the COVID-19 pandemic does not appear to have had an impact on the number of mediation requests, the number of mediation requests related to due process hearing complaints (or not related to due process hearing complaints), the number of mediations held, or the number of mediation agreements.

16 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 – OSEP Response

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

16 – Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

17 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

17 – Measurement

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

17 – Instructions

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

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

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

17 – Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

17 – Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;

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

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

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

- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

17 – Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

17 – Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

17 – A. Data Analysis

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

17 – B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

17 – C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

17 – Additional Implementation Activities

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

17 – Indicator Data

17 – Section A: Data Analysis

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

Utah's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is to increase the number of students with disabilities (SWD) with Speech Language Impairment (SLI) or Specific Learning Disability (SLD) in grades 6–8 who are proficient on the Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) statewide end-of-level mathematics assessment by 0.25 standard deviation over ten years (or a target proficiency rate of 10.95% by 2022–2023).

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

NO

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

NO

17 – Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

17 – Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Utah Middle School Math Theory of Action

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

NO

17 – If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

This report will be a closing of the Utah SSIP focused on middle school mathematics. In the next reporting year, Utah will be transitioning to an SSIP focused on post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities, specifically students who do not exit with their 4-year graduation cohort, sometimes referred to as "super seniors."

In the Fall of 2019, the Utah Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) made up of agency director-level personnel identified a need to improve postsecondary transition outcomes for youth with disabilities in Utah. The CCPD formally voted to begin collaborative efforts to this end. The USBE volunteered to facilitate the collaborative work and developed the Utah Statewide Collaborative on Improving Postsecondary Transition Outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities (STC).

The STC is a working partnership of all the state agencies and many other organizations that serve transition-age (14–22) youth across the state of Utah. The STC includes agencies and organizations that are disability-specific and agencies who serve the general population of transition-age youth (including youth with disabilities) to ensure the state infrastructure analysis thoroughly articulates the needs and resources of transition-age youth with disabilities.

The STC met monthly for one year to explore the current infrastructure and outcomes data of postsecondary transition in the state. Stakeholders took turns presenting the service and support activities they provide and the data about the outcomes of those activities for transition-age youth. The STC then identified gaps and overlaps. The STC developed a shared systems-change vision and common language, which includes a shared five- year goal/ target. The STC has also developed a theory of action and implementation activities to achieve the SiMR. The work of the STC will better define and support secondary transition to improve access to needed services and therefore improve student postsecondary outcomes in employment, postsecondary education, and independent living.

The results of the STC's collaborative work will be reported to state and federal policy makers for the five-year period of FFY 2021 to FFY 2025 through the USBE State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) SiMR.

The 2021 Indicator 14 data surveying exiters who had not previously exited with their cohorts (super seniors) from the 2020 school year showed that 45.65% of students ages 19–22 (super senior) respondents did not meet the criteria for inclusion in Indicator 14 (a, b, or c) meaning they were unengaged or under-engaged. This data was based on a survey response rate of 47.50% which represents 333 out of 701 super senior students.

Utah's New SiMR:

Utah will reduce the percentage of students ages 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Indicator 14 survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period (from 45.65% in FFY 2020 to 25.65% by FFY 2025).

In FFY 2020, 152 students ages 19–22 reported being unengaged or under-engaged. Achievement of Utah's SiMR would reduce that to only 85 students by FFY 2025.

Utah's new Theory of Action: If Utah implements the broad improvement strategies of 1) comprehensive supports for youth and families, 2) smooth flow of services, and 3) coordination of services, then Utah will reduce the percentage of students ages 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Indicator 14 survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period.

Activities that support each of the three improvement strategies will include:

1. Comprehensive supports for youth and families (Equitable access to supports and resources for transition-age youth and their families — the "who")
   a. Professional learning for educators
   b. Education and opportunities for youth and families (sharing information and improving skills)
   c. Improved access to supports and services for underserved populations
2. Smooth flow of services for transition-age youth (Describe the ideal transition experience – including K–12 education, critical or core services, early onset of services, professional learning, data sharing to support students across services — the "what")
   a. Improve our data match across agencies from 80% to 100%
   b. Describe (create a profile of) the ideal transition experience(s) based on students in our sample who are engaged in the community after school (Indicator 14C)
   c. Tracking services and engagement over time by student (CTE pathways, course of study, time in general education, age of referral to transition services, critical transition services such as pre-employment transition services (Pre-ETS) or Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services, or work-based learning experiences, etc.)
3. Coordination of services for transition-age youth in Utah (Systemic intentional coordination, streamlined referral processes, active collaboration, educating youth and families — the 'how')
   a. Continue and scale up the work of the STC
   b. Create a systematic referral process to use for referrals across agencies

c. Improve data sharing system to improve communication and coordination in co-serving youth across agencies
d. Create a common language to communicate with families about transition without jargon specific to different agencies

The STC is developing a Logic Model to guide the implementation of the new SSIP Theory of Action.

17 – Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

17 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	9.99%

17 –Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	10.13%	10.40%	10.68%	10.95%	11.22%	11.50%

17 – FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of students with disabilities (SWD) with Speech/Language Impairment (SLI) or Specific Learning Disability (SLD) in grades 6–8 who are proficient on the Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) statewide end-of-level mathematics assessment	Number of students with disabilities (SWD) with Speech/Language Impairment (SLI) or Specific Learning Disability (SLD) in grades 6–8	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,065	11,985	N/A	10.13%	8.89%	Did not meet target	N/A

17 – Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) statewide end-of-level mathematics assessment

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

Data are collected through the statewide RISE statewide end-of-level mathematics assessment then disaggregated by disability category and grade. The data are analyzed collaboratively by the

USBE Special Education and Data and Statistics teams by comparing current year data to previous trend data, as well as the data for this SiMR target population to all students with disabilities and all students with disabilities to all students without disabilities in the state.

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

NO

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

NO

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

YES

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

The UBSE Special Education team collaborated with the USBE Data and Statistics team to conduct an in-depth review of our participation and proficiency data for students with disabilities compared to previous test administration years and compared to students without disabilities.

Utah has a broad parental opt-out law, which has decreased Utah's statewide assessment participation rates for almost a decade. Utah's participation rates for students with disabilities in the 2021 testing window did decrease compared to previous years, but Utah's participation rate for all students also decreased, suggesting there is likely incomplete data available to determine valid and reliable impact of SSIP implementation on Utah's SiMR outcome. Utah believes the participation rate was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Even though Utah's schools were open for in-person learning, some families chose to keep their students at home for the majority of the 2020-2021 school year and chose to opt their students out of taking the assessment. Similarly, as students were exposed or tested positive for the virus, they were required to quarantine for at least seven days. When that occurred during the testing window, some students' parents chose not to arrange to have their students attend the assessment make-up sessions.

To increase assessment participation and ensure LEA staff understood the assessment and accountability Rules and procedures, the USBE provided professional learning (PL) and technical assistance (TA) to district and charter administrators, educators, and policy makers. The majority of Utah stakeholders were invested in ensuring that Utah students participated in the assessments and the Utah educators could access the data in a timely manner to support student learning and proficiency.

Utah's proficiency on the 2021 statewide assessment decreased in almost every grade and content area. The USBE Assessment and Accountability team worked with the Center for Assessment to do an in-depth review of the proficiency data as well as "opportunity to learn (OTL)" data that was collected along with the assessment. The assessment results have been shared with Utah stakeholders including policy makers and community members (educators, parents) and all stakeholders agree the COVID-19 pandemic significantly negatively impacted the proficiency of Utah's students. All Utah students received virtual-only instruction from mid-March 2020 to the end of school year (SY) 2019–2020, then some students received in-person instruction while others received virtual instruction and others received hybrid instruction during SY 2020–2021. Most students spent at least a few weeks quarantined during the school year because they had been exposed to or had tested positive for the virus. Thus, instruction was sometimes inconsistent or disjointed. Students with disabilities experienced the same negative effects as all students, and in some grades and content areas, their proficiency was impacted even more than students without disabilities. The summary report of the 2020–2021 assessment results can be found on the USBE's website. Utah believes the SiMR results were negatively impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic as they are a subset of the overall assessment results of Utah's students with disabilities. Though Utah did not meet the annual target for the SSIP and instead regressed from the 2018–2019 baseline reset data, Utah is pleased that the 2020–2021 SIMR results still exceed the initial SSIP data from 2013–2014 (7.1%).

In summary, Utah believes the data collected was as complete as Utah law allows and the COVID-19 pandemic did negatively impact the participation and proficiency data. At the same time, Utah believes the steps we took to mitigate these issues were appropriate and beneficial.

17 – Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

17 – Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Utah's SSIP Evaluation Plan can be found on the USBE website.

Utah's evaluation plan for the SSIP has two major parts. The first is the SiMR target calculation, which is calculated from the RISE statewide end-of-level assessment and is reported in the EMAPS tool.

The second part of the evaluation is the periodic evaluation of the components within each of the three Coherent Improvement Strategies including High Expectations, Content and Instruction, and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Utah evaluated the outcomes of the improvement strategies by 1) evaluating and adding to the infrastructure improvements needed to better support the implementation of the SSIP (included in Section B), 2) comparing the outputs from previous SSIP implementation years with the current year's outputs (included in Section B), 3) reviewing the output/outcome data of LEAs that have been implementing SSIP-implementation initiatives (see below), and 4) reviewing activities and progress with stakeholders (see Section C). Most of Utah's data is related to outputs, as opposed to outcomes, but the fact that educators and administrators continued to collaborate with us to review and improve practices, supports Utah's decision to continue implementing these strategies.

17 – Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

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

Utah's SSIP Theory of Action began with the identification of the three root cause concerns for poor achievement in the area of mathematics of students with disabilities in grades six through eight who were identified during Phase I of the SSIP. Those concerns were transformed into three Infrastructure Improvement Strategies, including High Expectations and Beliefs, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, and MTSS in Secondary Settings. The Theory of Action then demonstrated how each Infrastructure Improvement Strategy leveraged the strengths of USBE and LEA initiatives and priorities to build LEA capacity for improvement, while at the same time decreasing the impact of infrastructure gaps. All three Infrastructure Improvement Strategies were implemented during the reporting period and to summarize what is required to implement each Strategy, common components or considerations of and across each Strategy that were then turned into improvement activities are listed below.

Strategy I- High Expectations and Beliefs components:

1. Inclusion in grade-level Core content,
2. Assessment,
3. Graduation requirements and College and Career Ready (CCR) plans,
4. Leadership,
5. Partnerships and collaborations,
6. Preservice and in-service professional learning,
7. Data and Evidence-based practices (EBPs),
8. Active engagement of all school personnel,
9. IEP Team decisions, and
10. Fiscal support.

Strategy II- Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction components:

1. Math content and pedagogy to provide effective instruction through Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and evidence-based interventions,
2. Leadership,
3. Preservice and in-service professional learning,
4. Data and EBPs,
5. Active engagement of all school personnel,
6. IEP Team decisions, and
7. Fiscal support.

Strategy III- MTSS in Secondary Settings components:

1. Infrastructure, scale, and fidelity;
2. Leadership;
3. Preservice and in-service professional learning;
4. Data and EBPs;

5. Active engagement of all school personnel;
6. IEP Team decisions; and
7. Fiscal support.

Improvement efforts related to these three Infrastructure Improvement Strategies will not only improve state mathematics achievement results but also outcomes in graduation, dropout, and post-school outcomes as students with disabilities have the mathematics computation and application skills they need to be successful. Success includes passing required high school mathematics courses; taking and passing the American College Testing (ACT) assessment with a Utah college-ready score; getting accepted into post-high training programs, colleges, and universities; acquiring competitive employment; and/or living independently.

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

For six years, Utah's SSIP has described the state system and its capacity to assist LEAs in developing the needed capacity to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and then to evaluate the impact of Utah's improvement efforts. These improvement efforts aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The success of the SSIP required systematic improvement across the USBE and LEAs to leverage existing strengths while simultaneously closing system gaps. The USBE and LEAs needed to make the following systems changes to impact the SiMR:

1. Align and leverage current math achievement and school improvement initiatives,
2. Increase utilization of evidence-based practices (EBPs),
3. Improve infrastructure and coordination for delivering effective professional learning (PL) and technical assistance (TA),
4. Increase meaningful engagement of state and local stakeholders around SSIP efforts,
5. Increase capacity to effectively utilize available TA resources,
6. Increase capacity to implement general supervision systems that support effective implementation of the IDEA and ESSA,
7. Increase LEA access to funding targeted to implement each of the bullets above.

These combined improvement efforts have and will continue to lead to improved educational outcomes for all students in the area of mathematics proficiency, which in turn will also improve state results in graduation, dropout, and post-school outcomes as students with disabilities will have the mathematics computation and application skills they need to be successful.

To achieve the identified systems change, the USBE implemented the following activities (with their related outputs and/or outcomes) for each improvement strategy. Descriptions of each activity are provided in the summary of evidence-based practices.

High Expectations:

1) Mathematics Equity Meet-Ups (quality standards, professional development, and technical assistance): Approximately 40 educators from across the state participated in each of the eight virtual monthly meetings.
2) Book Study (professional learning and technical assistance): Utah provided a parent book study in FFY 2020 on "Grit" by Angela Duckworth for 150 participants.
3) Equity Corner at State Mathematics Coordinators Committee (quality standards, professional learning, and technical assistance): Approximately 60 State Mathematics leaders engaged in equity and inclusion discussions four times during the year.

Content and Instruction:

1) Special Education Mathematics Endorsement (governance): Support for special education teachers has increased throughout the state, with over 50 secondary math special education teachers enrolled in cohorts across the state including Nebo School District, Salt Lake Community College, through a program at Utah State University, and within districts.
2) As LEAs that did not meet APR Indicator 3 targets: (governance, data, finance, accountability/
monitoring, quality standards, professional learning, and technical assistance): LEAs access PL, TA, and ongoing coaching to improve math instruction, intervention, and programming, Utah anticipates the math proficiency scores of SWD in these LEAs to increase.
3) Co-teaching (professional learning and technical assistance): Utah continued to provide an annual co-teaching initiative cohort. This year, the USBE offered a year one and year two professional learning cohort. Year one is designed for participants new to Co-teaching or participants that are a new content team. Year two is designed for participants who previously participated in a cohort within the last three years and want to increase their knowledge of Co-teaching strategies and gain further support. This year, we have 32 teachers participating in the year one cohort and eight participating in the year two cohort.
4) IEP Reflective Framework (governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, and technical assistance) : IEP Task Force created the Framework to support stakeholders in improving IEP goals and services. Currently, more than 200 educators have attended webinars and training on the Framework. A mathematics leadership group of 30 was trained in SY 2020–2021 to facilitate discussions within their LEAs to promote effective implementation during SY 2021–2022.
5) Newsletters for Administrators and Teachers (quality standards, professional learning, and technical assistance): Monthly newsletter sent to over 1,000 subscribers.

MTSS:

1) Equity-based MTSS Canvas course (quality standards, professional learning, and technical assistance): Developed but then placed on hold for implementation due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
2) Cross-Departmental Implementation Team (CDIT) (data, finance, quality standards, professional learning, and technical assistance): Created an Interventions Document aligned

to the agency High Quality Instruction Document and will be used for statewide professional learning in the upcoming year.

As an anecdotal indication of short-term outcome toward SiMR achievement, below is an LEA example of improvement strategy implementation.

The special education director of Tooele County School District (TCSD) submitted a training request through our training request portal (TRP) asking for support for her teachers for specially designed instruction (SDI) in mathematics in May of 2021. The concern was that students with disabilities were being pulled out of the general education classroom during the instruction time from the content expert in mathematics. The curriculum director and special education director from TCSD with the SDI specialist from the USBE began planning the sessions for the TCSD teachers.

On August 10, 2021, a half-day session on SDI was provided to the upper grade elementary special education teachers by the USBE specialist. At that time, participants were provided with their data of qualifying students in the different disability categories to compare to the state data. Looking at the SLD category, there were some noticeable differences the participants became aware of and brought up in their conversations. They noticed that grades 2, 4, 8, and 10 were all 9% above the state average and grade 12 was 11% above. At the conclusion of this discussion, it was decided that each of the special education teachers needed to invite a general education teacher they worked with to the remaining sessions that were planned for the school year which would not only focus on SDI, but would also include a book study on “Humanizing Disability in Mathematics Education” by Paulo Tan et. al. The teams met five times to discuss their readings and compared the information to their instructional experiences and their students’ data. They also planned how to better collaborate to deliver content. Thirteen teachers responded to an exit survey with 11 reporting the sessions were valuable or highly valuable and the other two expressing neutral value.

The participants have been challenged at each session to open their mindset as they work with their students with disabilities. The USBE specialist has given them tasks to do which have pushed them outside their comfort zones and has moved them to work with their general education partners more closely.

Based on discussions with Utah’s stakeholders, they agree the improvement activities currently being implemented are appropriate to impact the SiMR and to improve math outcomes for students with disabilities as educators first increase expectations for students with disabilities and then improve instruction and supports to ensure student learning and content mastery.

17 – Did the State implement any NEW (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

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

As Utah is changing our SiMR focus from middle school mathematics to post-high transition outcomes, Utah will not be reporting on the middle school mathematics improvement strategies

in the next reporting period. Utah will report on the anticipated outcomes of the three new post-school outcomes improvement strategies of 1) comprehensive supports for youth and families, 2) smooth flow of services, and 3) coordination of services. The anticipated outcomes in the next reporting period for these strategies are: increasing the number of educators participating in postsecondary transition professional learning opportunities; increase the number of transition-age youth participating in transition learning opportunities (i.e., work-based learning opportunities and pre-employment transition services); increase the number and improve the quality of data sharing agreements between agencies that serve transition-age youth; and begin collaboratively (across agencies and organizations) developing defined expectations for transition experiences for youth in Utah.

17 – List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period.

1) Utah provided professional learning on evidenced-based practices in mathematics that included implementation of:
2) Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework
3) Five anchors of differentiation into the Standards for Mathematical Practices
4) National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) Teaching Practices
5) Coherence Map and Utah Core Guides
6) Tasks using the Comprehensive Mathematics Instruction Framework to improve task-based instruction, increase content knowledge, and develop student self-awareness and identity in math.

17 – Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Utah has continued to provide LEAs with PL and TA about EBPs for math including distributing resources from national repositories (What Works Clearinghouse, American Institute for Research, and Evidence for ESSA) to ensure SWD have access to the content and the interventions they need to master it.

Utah has also shared resources with LEAs regarding multi-tiered supports from the National Center on Systemic Improvement, the National Center on Intensive Interventions, and the National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance at the Institute of Education Sciences.

Additionally, Utah has decreased ineffective practices such as within-class grouping, ability grouping, retention, extending a math course over two years, and low expectations. The decrease in these practices has been as important as implementing EBPs. Utah will continue efforts to reduce and eliminate ineffective practices which have led to SWD taking off-grade-level mathematics courses and assessments. As LEAs implement EBPs and discontinue the use of ineffective practices, SWD will have more equitable access and be successful with grade-level Core content.

The following is a summary of activities that included implementation or PL of the EBPs outlined in the box above.

- Parent Book Study: “Grit” by Angela Duckworth for 150 participants. The anticipated outcome was to increase awareness of the need for parents to have high expectations for their SWD and to require that IEPs articulate support for those expectations with rigorous goals and appropriate services and placement. The Parent Book Study implements EBP: 3.
- Monthly Mathematics Equity Meet-ups increase awareness and knowledge of evidence-based practices via presentations from national speakers. The monthly meet-ups were provided to Utah educators and included state leaders from the Association of State Supervisors of Mathematics, incorporated professional learning for implementation, and included dialogue for the following EBPs: 1, 3, 4, and 5.
- IEP Task Force designed the IEP Reflective Framework to support stakeholders in improving efforts regarding IEP’s. The framework is being piloted in SY 2021–2022 and will be rolled out to all LEAs in SY 2022–2023. The USBE looks forward to reviewing data from the implementation of the IEP Reflective Framework model and anticipates it will result in improved outcomes for SWD, though improved outcomes data will likely take several school years to manifest. The completed IEP Reflective Framework supports EBPs and compliance to support effective PLAFFP, Special Factors, Goals, Service Time and SDI, Accommodations and Modifications, and Transition and implements the following EBPs: 1, 2, 3, and 4.
- Cross-Departmental Implementation Team (CDIT) created an Interventions Document aligned to the agency High Quality Instruction Document. This document is intended for statewide use to support stakeholders in identifying and implementing appropriate interventions with professional learning planned for the upcoming school year and implements the following EBPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- Equity Corner at State Mathematics Coordinators Committee. State Mathematics leaders engaged in equity and inclusion discussions to increase student achievement using the following EBPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- Newsletters for Administrators and Teachers: Monthly articles that increase awareness and provide information that focuses on content, instruction, and high expectations for students with disabilities and implements the following EBPs: 2, 3, and 5.
- Co-teaching: Utah continued to provide an annual Co-teaching initiative cohort. As more general education and special education teachers are trained to plan and facilitate instruction and intervention together, more SWD can access and master grade-level content, leading to improved proficiency. The Co-teaching cohort implements the following EBPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
- Special Education Mathematics Endorsement: Endorsement has been revised and support for special education teachers has increased throughout the state. Cohorts of teachers have started coursework in Nebo School District, Salt Lake Community College, and within other districts. The Special Education Mathematics Endorsement implements the following EBPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

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

Math Equity Meet-ups increase awareness and knowledge of EBPs via having national presenters provide hands-on professional learning and dialogue with Utah educators. The monthly

discussions have changed policies, procedures, and practices in the following ways: Educators focused on deeper understanding of UDL to support students who learn differently (Dr. Cathery Yeh), effective implementation of the NCTM Teaching Practices and CMI Framework (USBE leadership), stronger connections to Utah Core Standards and Core Guides for Mathematics (USBE mathematics team), importance of Asset-based language (Nora Ramirez), and the importance of eliminating barriers for students including policies that support the de-tracking of students (Steve Leinwand). These activities have led some districts to ensure SWD receive grade-level content, are not placed in below grade-level courses, and have increased teacher implementation of Utah Core Standards for Mathematics.

The IEP Task Force has created a Reflective IEP Framework and is in the process of increasing awareness and developing TA documents to support each section of the document. Mathematics teachers and leaders are working together to create a process for IEP teams to consider when creating IEP goals. The process deepens knowledge of how the standards are coherent, supports the team in making decisions about focusing on sustainable concepts, allows for student agency in showing their knowledge (including student choice and voice), incorporates student strengths with input from parent/caregiver and student, and promotes collaboration between all stakeholders within the IEP team.

The CDIT Team has created an Intervention document to align with our agency's High Quality Instruction Cycle Framework. This document is being finalized and intends to improve practices for identifying students for interventions and implementing effective “in the moment supports” for students.

The Equity Corner at SMECC supported procedural changes such as ensuring students have access to grade level content, improving general education awareness of Teaching Practices to engage SWD via humanizing mathematics (NCTM’s Teaching Practices and implementing high quality tasks via CMI Framework), and providing PL to state mathematics leaders related to Social Emotional Academic Development. The Equity Corner at SMECC also supported teacher reflection on how to improve instructional practices to improve student outcomes.

The Special Education Mathematics Endorsement is policy for any special education teacher who is the primary teacher of record for SWD in a secondary setting. The requirements for the endorsement focus on high expectations, content and instruction, and MTSS to ensure SWD receive instruction from teachers who have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach grade-level content in secondary mathematics.

The Parent Book Study for FFY 2020 was “Grit” by Angela Duckworth. The book study increased parent and community knowledge so they could better advocate for students to have more rigorous content and instruction. As an example, some schools within Weber School District changed practice and reduced tracking practices as a result of parent and community involvement.

The Newsletters for Administrators and Teachers provide information on professional research and opportunities that encourage educators to improve upon their practice and advocate for policy and procedure changes to better support having all SWD achieve at high levels.

The Co-teaching Cohort at USBE offered two cohort options: year one and year two. Year one is designed for participants new to Co-teaching or participants that are a new content team. Year

two is designed for participants who previously participated in a cohort within the last three years and want to increase their knowledge of Co-teaching strategies and gain further support. As more general education and special education teachers are trained to plan and facilitate instruction and intervention together, more SWD will be able to access and master grade-level content, leading to improved proficiency.

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

To monitor fidelity of SSIP strategy implementation, Utah works with each individual LEA implementing SSIP activities to incorporate fidelity checks into their activity evaluation plans and has also incorporated fidelity checks into our statewide Co-teaching initiative.

Box Elder School District has drastically decreased the percentage of students who have lost proficiency from grades 5 through 8 over the past seven years. In 2014–2015, of the 5th graders with disabilities who were proficient, 82% of them were no longer proficient by the time they were in 8th grade. In 2017–2018, of the 5th graders with disabilities who were proficient, only 30% of those students with disabilities were no longer proficient in 8th grade (SY 2020–2021). This district attributes this growth to two main areas: 1) an increase in students being with their peers in general education more often during math time and to 2) USBE PL they received on Co-teaching (an implementation of all five evidenced-based practices outlined above).

Math Equity/SMECC/Math Coaching Institute: Several LEAs/schools have reported changing practice to support SWD being given access to grade-level content by increasing the amount of time students spend with their general education peers, receiving training on Teaching Practices and Co-teaching, and learning from peers at the USBE Mathematics Coaching Institute.

Co-teaching: Utah is providing PL and TA for a Co-teaching initiative as introduced above. Each Co-teaching team consisting of a general educator and a special educator is observed by instructional coaches at least twice during the year to provide the teams with feedback about their practice and monitor fidelity of the implementation of the co-teaching model. The coaches look for the implementation of grade-appropriate content, evidence-based Co-teaching model implementation, as well as EBPs in math and then debrief the teams about how to increase the use and impact of EBPs. (However, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, not all observations were conducted.) Further, participants in the Co-teaching initiative were asked to respond to three surveys during the PL event to ensure they are mastering the math content so they can in turn provide the content to students. (Again, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, very few surveys were returned. There were 32 participants, 20 of whom responded to the first survey, 14 to the second, and zero responded to the final survey.) The Co-teaching initiative is pursuing more robust ways to ensure the teams are implementing evidence-based Co-teaching practices with fidelity. As providing the initiative's PL and TA virtually has been surprisingly successful, virtual options will continue to be provided to participants to provide greater access to the initiative.

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

As Utah is changing our SiMR focus from middle school mathematics to post-high transition outcomes, Utah will not be reporting on the ongoing use of EBPs in mathematics, but Utah will begin implementing EBPs to improve post-high transition outcomes. To inform the STC's work of choosing a collaborative post-high outcome goal, the USBE did a thorough literature review of EBPs that improve post-secondary outcomes. The literature review identified competencies and experiences that predict positive post-secondary outcomes, which are listed in the next box. (The USBE utilized TA from the National [NCSI] Center on Systemic Improvement and the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition-Collaborative [NTACT-C) to collect and analyze the literature.)

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

The following competencies and experiences for transition-age youth are evidence-based predictors of positive post-school outcomes which the STC will be incorporating into the three improvement strategies of our new Theory of Action:

- Community experiences
- Parental involvement/parental expectations
- Workplace readiness skills such as travel skills, technology skills, and social skills
- Exit exam/High School diploma status
- Program of study
- Student support
- Work study/paid employment/work experiences
- Self-determination/self-advocacy
- Interagency collaboration
- Goal setting/autonomous decision-making
- Inclusion in general education
- Occupational course-taking/career and technical education
- Career awareness

Activities listed in Section A (above) that include these EBPs have been chosen to address Utah's new SiMR to reduce the percentage of students ages 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Indicator 14 survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period.

The following outputs and/or outcomes are expected during the next reporting period related to Utah's new SiMR focus:

- Increase the number of educators participating in postsecondary transition professional learning opportunities
- Increase the number of transition-age youth participating in transition learning opportunities (i.e., work-based learning opportunities and pre-employment transition services)

- Increase the number and improve the quality of data sharing agreements between agencies that serve transition-age youth
- Begin collaboratively (across agencies and organizations) developing defined expectations for transition experiences for youth in Utah

17 – Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

17 – Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE shared data and target information during a full day APR summit, through surveys, USBE meetings, in newsletters, emails, and on social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA Administrators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to students with disabilities
- Utah Educators

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021. Over 100 participants attended from the stakeholder groups and those with individual interests. Participants reviewed data and the projections for the State in 2025–2026. Participants were provided with an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of predictive models as well as an overview of the mindset for target-setting. Participants were told they would be selecting the end target (2025–2026) for a given Indicator. The State would then calculate intervening targets between FFY2020 and FFY2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by increases in small increments. Using small increments at the beginning is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and to change practices so they can realistically meet the targets along their way to the rigorous end target. After this overview, the participants then determined a challenging and achievable target for the 2025–2026 school year. The USBE calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants as well as additional stakeholders to get final approval for all the targets.

A survey was sent out and 101 individuals participated. Most participants identified as white females in suburban parts of Utah. American Indian or Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as two or more races also participated.

Targets were impacted by this stakeholder feedback. The USBE recommended targets for Indicator 5 were considered too high by participants. The USBE revised the targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs.

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE statistician, APR summit and APR survey review, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs.

Indicator 1
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed graduation data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 67.90%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 2
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed dropout data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 25.81%, targets will decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 3A
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment participation data. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. This target cannot be changed by the USBE. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

Indicators 3B, C, and D
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed assessment proficiency and gap data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants looked at the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This process allowed participants to analyze the best statistical guess of where Utah's data would most likely be in six years while also seeing the forecasting of possible error over time for predicting far into the future. Once agreement among participants was finalized on the long term six-year target, the USBE set smaller increases in the early years with more significant increases in the later years.

Indicator 5
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 65.12%, (B) 9.71%, (C) 2.67%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 6
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool educational environment data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With baselines of (A) 46.86%, (B) 32.67%, (C) 0.25%, targets will gradually increase and decrease with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 7
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed preschool outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The

USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A1) 88.86%, (A2) 58.94%, (B1) 88.41%, (B2) 50.48%, (C1) 89.86%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 8
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed parent involvement data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. With a baseline of 78.38%, targets will gradually increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12
During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in meeting the targets for these Indicators. Input has been utilized to determine professional learning and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and the targets.

Indicator 13
The USBE recognizes this is an area requiring improvement. During the APR Summit, stakeholders reviewed current data trends and ways to improve outcomes. Although targets cannot be changed, stakeholder input has been instrumental in the progression toward meeting the target.

Indicator 14
During the APR Summit, the USBE reviewed post-school outcomes data and recommendations of the USBE statistician. Participants analyzed trend data as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre-COVID-19 data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. The USBE predicts that outcomes for this Indicator are still being largely impacted by COVID-19, and targets are currently set below the baseline. With baselines of (A) 19.62%, (B) 67.60%, (C) 84.37%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

Indicator 15
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of due process hearing requests and resolution meetings and is not required to set a target.

Indicator 16
The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution requests, including mediation. Targets have been set based on the low level of mediation requests.

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

Utah’s original SSIP focus of middle school math is continuing to be implemented through FFY 2021 under the leadership of the Math Equity Specialist and the State Director of Special Education. The Theory of Action’s improvement strategies of High Expectations, Content and Instruction, and MTSS are being impacted through statewide and targeted PL and TA. All the stakeholder groups Utah has reported working with in previous SSIP reports continued to be part of the conversation this past year. Utah's stakeholders were engaged in the implementation of the SSIP in several specific and significant ways which are broken down by activity below.

Parents and Community Members

1. Parent Book Study: “Grit” by Angela Duckworth
2. State Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Special Needs Committee discussions about the achievement and growth of students with disabilities in mathematics
3. Monthly Special Education e-Newsletter articles

Educators

1. Mathematics Educators: Math Advisory Team discussions, Elementary Mathematics Specialist Institute, Mathematics for ALL Institute (Intervention, IEP Goals, Asset-based language training)
2. Special Educators: “Accessible Mathematics” book study, IEP Reflective Framework discussions during statewide Special Education Administrators meetings, Mathematics for ALL Institute (Intervention, IEP Goals, Asset-based language training)
3. Gifted and Talented Educators: “Excellence Gap” Book Study
4. Preservice Math Educators: Elementary Math Methods course participation
5. LEA-specific Mathematics PL requests, Mathematics Equity Meet Ups, Special Education Elementary Mathematics Teachers Round Table discussions
6. School Counselors: Discussion about outcomes for students with disabilities based on course-taking patterns
7. Monthly Special Education e-Newsletter articles

Administrators

1. Monthly Special Education Administrator newsletter
2. Mathematics Co-teaching Cohort trainings and site visits

Policy Makers

1. Utah School Boards Association: discussions of how to increase meaningful inclusion of students with disabilities across the state
2. Utah State Board of Education members: discussions of how to increase meaningful inclusion of students with disabilities across the state

As described above, the Coordinating Council of People with Disabilities (CCPD) has spent more than a year collaboratively determining that improving post-secondary outcomes for youth with disabilities is a vital need in Utah. The USBE has determined that in order to support the CCPD’s decision to focus on post-secondary transition outcomes, it is in the best interest of students with disabilities to change our SiMR focus to address the CCPD focus. An unprecedented number of state agency staff and staff in nonprofit and postsecondary transition-oriented service organizations around the state have contributed to the infrastructure analysis, data analysis and goal setting discussions that have led the USBE to determine a new SiMR target to reduce the percentage of students ages 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Indicator 14 survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period. The agencies and organizations that will be collaborating to implement Utah’s new Theory of Action (and Logic Model) are:

- USBE Special Education, Adult Education, Youth in Custody/Care and Neglected and Delinquent Youth, and Career and Technical Education; Utah Statewide Independent Living Council; Utah Registry of Autism and Developmental Disabilities; Utah Parent Teacher Assocation; Department of Workforce Services; Office of Rehabilitative Services; Department

of Health and Human Services High-fidelity Wraparound System of Care, Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice Services, Stabilization and Mobile Response, Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health, Division of Services for People with Disabilities, Children with Special Health Care Needs, and Medicaid; Intermountain Health Care; Salt Lake County Health Department Health Teen Coalition; Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind; Utah System of Higher Education; Governor's Committee on Employment for People with Disabilities; and, Utah State University Institute for Disability Research, Policy, and Practice.

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

NO

17 – Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

No concerns were expressed.

17 – Additional Implementation Activities

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

Utah is beginning a new SiMR focus. (See Section A above)

Activities that support each of the three new SiMR improvement strategies will include:

1. Comprehensive supports for youth and families (Equitable access to supports and resources for transition-age youth and their families — the 'who')
   a. Professional learning for educators
   b. Education and opportunities for youth and families (sharing information and improving skills)
   c. Improve access to supports and services for underserved populations
2. Smooth flow of Services for transition-age youth (Describe the ideal transition experience including K–12 education, critical or core services, early onset of services, professional learning, data sharing to support students across services — the 'what')
   a. Improve our data match across agencies from 80% to 100%
   b. Describe the ideal transition experience based on students in our sample who are engaged in the community after school (14C)
   c. Tracking services and engagement over time by student (CTE pathways, course of study, time in general education, age of referral to transition services, critical transition services such as Pre-ETS or VR, work-based learning experiences)
3. Coordination of services for transition-age youth in Utah (systemic intentional coordination, streamlined referral processes, active collaboration, educating youth and families — the 'how')
   a. Continue and scale up the collaboration of the STC
   b. Create a systematic referral process to use for referrals across agencies
   c. Improve data sharing system to improve communication and coordination in co-serving youth across agencies
   d. Create a common language to communicate with families about transition without jargon specific to different agencies

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

The STC will begin implementing Utah's new Theory of Action using Utah's new SSIP Logic Model in February of 2022. The STC will collect data on each of the 10 activities described in the box above during and at the end of SY 2021–2022 and evaluate the outputs and/or outcomes of each activity to determine if Utah's efforts are reducing the percentage of students ages 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Indicator 14 survey. If the activities identified in the box above are not leading to the meaningful change Utah's Theory of Action assumes, the STC will immediately pivot and update the new SSIP Logic Model to better align activities with intended outcomes.

Specifically, the following outputs and/or outcomes are expected during the next reporting period related to Utah's new SiMR focus:

- Increase the number of educators participating in post-secondary transition professional learning opportunities
- Increase the number of transition-age youth participating in transition learning opportunities (i.e., work-based learning opportunities and pre-employment transition services)
- Increase the number and improve the quality of data sharing agreements between agencies that serve transition-age youth
- Begin collaboratively (across agencies and organizations) developing defined expectations for transition experiences for youth in Utah

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

The STC has identified that a possibly major, but hopefully only minor, barrier to achieving our new SiMR focus is the difficulty of agencies and organizations who serve transition-aged youth in Utah to share data about the youth with disabilities they serve. In order to determine which youth are receiving which services and create profiles of success and needed support(s), data sharing is vital. Thus, developing data sharing systems and agreements is an improvement strategy the STC has identified is necessary to achieve the SiMR.

17 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 – OSEP Response

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

17 – Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier’s role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Leah Voorhies

Title:

Assistant Superintendent of Student Support

Email:

leah.voorhies@schools.utah.gov

Phone:

8015387898

Submitted on:

April 27, 2022