

State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report: Part B

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

For reporting on

FFY 2021

Utah



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

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 2021, Utah met 26 of 51 targets of the applicable Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators. These included indicators measuring drop out, assessments, suspension/expulsion, educational environments, preschool outcomes, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, and resolution sessions.

All FFY 2021 indicator data has been reviewed extensively by the Utah State Board of Education Special Education Services (USBE SES) section to ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD) by linking local education agency (LEA) data to improvement efforts.

The extensive review of Indicator 1, 2, and 3 data identified discrepancies between USBE SES data and pre-populated data on EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS). All discrepancies are noted in the narratives and include correct data or access to correct data.

Indicators 4, 9, and 10 were reviewed and researched extensively during FFY 2021. The IDEA Data Center (IDC) helped the USBE SES redetermine calculations, more appropriately identify LEAs, and improve the process for ensuring compliance. This led to increases in identification and the inability to meet targets. We regret that we were unable to meet these targets but consider it more important to identify and support needs within the LEAs.

The COVID-19 pandemic continued to impact Utah schools. During the 2021–2022 school year, most LEAs returned to traditional formats including virtual and in-person learning. Recoupment of lost learning is reflected in assessment data found in Indicator 3.

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 Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

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 SWD (Rules VIII.C.3.).

The USBE SES uses the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) to monitor and support compliance with requirements in Utah LEAs. This system aligns with the federal Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) system to monitor states. UPIPS encompasses external monitoring by the USBE SES and internal monitoring by the LEA. The purpose of UPIPS is to ensure a meaningful and continuous process focusing on improving academic and social outcomes for SWD by linking LEA data to improvement efforts and ensuring compliance with the IDEA. 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 generates data Utah is required to report to OSEP regarding the indicators on the SPP/APR.

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 APR indicators 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 Targeted Improvement and Support Tier (TIST). The USBE SES provides tiered supports and activities for improvement and risk mitigation to LEAs based on their 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 SWD.

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 LEA collaborate with diverse stakeholders in the following areas: 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 SWD.
- **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:** Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a self-assessment and root cause analysis process to review and improve outcomes for SWD using data that align with both the USBE's and the LEA's performance goals and the SPP/APR indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the self-assessment process may include, but are not limited to, the Utah State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) areas and SPP/APR indicators that make up the RDA score, personnel needs, and other LEA improvement efforts and initiatives.

- Technical Assistance (TA): The UPIPS process is continuous. TA is a critical component of program improvement. The USBE SES provides TA and professional learning (PL). LEAs are encouraged to evaluate and include TA as part of their PIPs.

IDENTIFICATION AND CORRECTION OF NONCOMPLIANCE

The USBE SES reviews data collected from LEAs during program improvement monitoring, indicator monitoring, dispute resolution, LEA report/data submissions, and other areas deemed necessary to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and the USBE Rules. Data collected on the date of the visit is reported in the SPP/APR as the level of compliance.

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.

- Prong 1: Correcting Each Individual Case of Student-Specific Noncompliance: The LEA must submit documentation that it has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student's special education file is no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction. The LEA documents correction by providing evidence to the USBE SES for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.
- Prong 2: Correctly Implementing the Specific Regulatory Requirements: In conjunction with Prong 1 corrections, the LEA will be required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents correction by providing evidence to the USBE SES for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

USBE TIERED SUPPORT

The USBE SES provides differentiated levels of support to LEAs based on the assigned risk score given through the RDA process. While the USBE SES continually monitors IDEA compliance, a focus has also been placed on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student outcomes. The USBE SES has conceptualized its IDEA general supervision, monitoring, and accountability systems to more effectively support LEAs in delivering special education programs focused on improving academic and social outcomes for SWD and ensuring compliance.

SUPPORTS FOR LEAS IN ALL TIERS

The USBE SES seeks to provide support to all LEAs as they continuously review and improve special education programs. Supports and activities may include:

- TA: documents, newsletters (SpEdOmeter, eNewsletter), website resources

- USBE SES Specialist coaching and support: assessment, accessibility and accommodations, behavior, collaboration with general education programs, data and reporting, dispute resolution, effective instruction, fiscal, inclusion, licensing, parent and family engagement, preschool, postsecondary transition, rules/regulations/policies and procedures, UPIPS
- Utah Special Education Administrators' Meeting (USEAM)
- PL courses: data literacy, fiscal recorded trainings, New Leaders' Summit (NLS; special education leaders), Running Start (special education teachers)
- LEA-identified needs submitted via the Training Request Portal (TRP)
- Conference opportunities: Institute on Special Education Law, Systems Conference, Transition Institute, etc.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORTS FOR LEAS IN ASSISTING, COACHING, AND DIRECTING TIERS

LEAs in these Tiers reflect an increased level of need. An At-Risk Support Specialist is assigned to contact LEAs to review data to determine the best ways collaboratively tackle LEA obstacles. LEAs can receive two hrs of support per month in Assisting, four hrs in Coaching, and six hrs in Directing. LEAs can request additional time as needed.

LEAs can reach out any time, but the Specialist will regularly contact LEA special education leadership. Participation in NLS is recommended. Other possible options of targeted support may include problem-solving, specific indicator support, root cause analysis, program improvement, and internal monitoring.

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

USBE provided TA in a variety of ways to ensure all participants could participate in a safe way:

- Meeting and training in virtual and in-person formats.
- Asynchronous and synchronous learning opportunities.
- A webpage with resources for administrators and teachers including extensive TA on the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Framework.
- Utilization of Padlets to centralize specific information.
- Virtual and in-person monitoring visits.
- Utilization of a secure online document storage platform.

INDICATORS 1, 2

The USBE SES developed a TA video module for Indicators 1 and 2 data including support documents for LEAs to better understand data reports on these indicators. The USBE SES provides each LEA director with a "Dropout Event Summary Report" at the beginning of the school year. This allows LEAs to update inaccurate high school completion status and exit codes. Training and TA is provided to LEAs for submitting updates to codes.

INDICATOR 3

The USBE SES provided a variety of TA to help LEAs improve student academic outcomes including 1% monitoring visits focusing on students with significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCD), RDA coaching, a community of practice integrated coaching for LEAs with the lowest performing SWD, annual data literacy meetings, individual LEA Indicator 3 data sessions, alternate achievement standards instruction, and assessment PL experiences.

INDICATOR 5

The USBE SES provided TA on special education service time, environment, and placement in addition to effective instruction and inclusive practices to support students across the continuum of placement. LEAs continue to increase the percentage of SWD receiving most of their services in general education settings with support through co-teaching and ongoing collaboration between general and special education teachers. TA and PL are provided continually using the multi-tiered system of supports tools and resources developed through the personnel development grant. The USBE created a workgroup of various stakeholders to develop the IEP Framework to assist IEP teams with the alignment of compliance and best practices when developing a student's IEP by supporting the effective implementation of targeted services and supports.

INDICATORS 6, 7, 12

The USBE provided TA to LEAs on early childhood environments, preschool outcomes data collection, and Part C to Part B transition requirements. TA was provided to LEAs at monthly statewide preschool coordinator meetings and through PL opportunities.

INDICATOR 11

TA was provided to LEAs during monitoring. Based on trends uncovered during monitoring, additional training was provided to more clearly explain the Indicator 11 requirements and the rules regarding consent. In February 2022, a newsletter article was distributed to special education directors outlining initial evaluation requirements.

INDICATORS 13, 14

The USBE SES brought multiple online resources together using Padlet. The Padlets cover topics such as postsecondary transition assessments, the postsecondary transition process, virtual resources, and post-school outcomes. The Padlets offer educators a central location to access links to needed resources and support to maximize their PL opportunities. The USBE continues to facilitate an inter-agency state transition team with the USBE Postsecondary 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 postsecondary transition and anticipates expanding to include school counseling. USBE Postsecondary Transition Specialists updated TA documents (Tips for Writing Compliant Transition Plans (Indicator 13) and Postsecondary Transition Services Examples). USBE Postsecondary Transition Specialists held monthly Postsecondary Transition Talks for all educators to receive TA with a variety of postsecondary transition areas. A USBE

Postsecondary Transition Specialist provided coaching during virtual monitoring visits for Indicator 13.

INDICATORS 15, 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 TA PARTICIPATION

Utah's Part B IDEA determination in 2022 was "needs assistance." National TA participation has been a strength as the USBE SES works to improve outcomes. The USBE SES appreciates the resources and opportunity to receive TA from various centers to improve state performance leading to improved outcomes for SWD.

Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

The USBE Postsecondary Transition Specialists attended National Technical Assistance on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) state-to-state sharing calls on collaboration between Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and CTE, which provides the needed TA for USBE to support LEAs with Indicator 13. The USBE receives ongoing Indicator 14 support from Jennifer Jacobs, Utah's Indicator 14 contractor with the Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) #7. 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 SES participated in the TA group hosted by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), the 1% Cap Community of Practice (CoP) related to the 1% cap and SWSCD. The CoP has a 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 SWSCD. The USBE utilized TA from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to ensure access for SWD 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 the Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), a multi-state collaborative to share data and implementation plans regarding assessment for SWSCD.

Indicators 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16

The USBE received TA from TAESE, IDC, NCSI, and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). 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 USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist participated in calls with IDC, ECTA, and NCSI. The USBE SES 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 with TA through the Flamboyan Foundation fellowship. The USBE SES 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. USBE SES staff attended training on conducting virtual mediations and hearings and provided TA to all dispute resolution contractors on using virtual platforms and ensuring dispute resolution processes continued despite COVID-19 restrictions. The USBE SES and its dispute resolution contractors 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

The USBE SES continues to provide PL in a variety of ways including:

- In-person and virtual opportunities.
- Asynchronous and synchronous opportunities.
- Protecting class time by limiting meetings and PL experiences during school hours.

In July 2021, the USBE SES hosted a free annual institute on special education law. Virtual and in-person options were provided for attendees. Over 1,300 educators, lawyers, and administrators attended to receive current information on IDEA requirements. This was a 30% increase in participation over the 2020 institute. Sessions included dispute resolution, special education law, family engagement, and compliant practices.

An asynchronous data literacy course was provided to LEAs in February 2022. Each SPP/APR indicator was explained including what the indicator is, how it is calculated, and where LEAs can find more information and form goals around the indicator. USBE SES Specialists held virtual office hours where LEAs could make appointments to review data and develop goals. Over 85 appointments were held. The course has remained open and continues to be viewed as LEAs have questions about specific indicators.

The TRP allows LEAs to request training in specific areas of need. The TRP is available for special education and all other areas of student support at the USBE (e.g., equity, prevention, behavior support, etc.). This provides an opportunity for USBE cross-collaboration that would be better served by more systemic PL experiences. The USBE coordinating staff meet weekly to review requests and assign staff to follow up on the requests. Requests lead to PL opportunities, TA, and support. Fifty-three LEAs made 122 requests in the 2021-2022 school year.

LEAs identified as high risk are provided additional TA and support determined annually by the TIST. All LEAs are provided PL, TA, and online resources. Details are outlined in the “General Supervision System” section above.

In addition to the PL described below for specific indicators, the USBE SES provided data literacy training in February 2022 with recorded training videos on all indicators. Special education directors were able to schedule TA/coaching sessions with USBE SES Specialists on the indicators.

INDICATORS 1, 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.

INDICATOR 3

PL provided to help LEAs improve student academic outcomes included co-teaching, literacy and mathematics, alternate achievement standards instruction and assessment, online book studies with teachers and parents, and accommodations and assessment administration.

INDICATOR 4

In February 2022, training was provided to a select group of special education directors and USBE SES staff. The intent was to educate staff on the purpose and intent of the indicator and the rationale for changing the calculation and data collection process.

INDICATORS 6, 7, 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 PL opportunities.

INDICATOR 8

Each year, the USBE helps onboard new special education directors through NLS where parent engagement is taught and discussed.

INDICATORS 9, 10

In February 2022, training was provided to a select group of special education directors and USBE SES staff. The intent was to educate staff on the purpose and intent of the of these indicators and the rationale for changing the calculation and data collection process.

INDICATOR 11

Based on trends uncovered during monitoring, training was provided to more clearly explain the indicator 11 requirements and the rules regarding consent. FFY 2021 training provided is pivotal for monitoring changes made in FFY 2022.

INDICATORS 13, 14

The USBE places high importance on providing the foundation for writing compliant and effective postsecondary transition plans through an introductory training segment on Indicator 13. 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 PL opportunities to support LEAs with sessions focused on postsecondary outcomes including:

- NLS: Training on Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14.
- Running Start: Training on Indicator 13.
- Writing Compliant Transition Plans: An online course with a dedicated coaching module for participants to ask questions in each area of the postsecondary transition plan. Participants were required to complete all the course modules and a self-assessment of a transition-aged student's IEP.

- Indicator 13 and 14 Data Literacy Training: Targeted sessions for LEAs to examine and analyze their indicator reports for areas of strength and concern. Special education directors completed the training via a combination of a Canvas course and sessions with USBE Postsecondary Transition Specialists.
- 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 2021 Postsecondary Transition Institute: Delivered in a self-paced online learning management system instead of the traditional in-person format due to continuing pandemic restrictions. LEAs participated in the sessions with their postsecondary transition teams. Approximately 161 people participated, representing 16 LEAs with partnering agencies participating from around Utah. Support was provided by the USBE SES to postsecondary transition team leaders in the form of virtual CoP sessions during the 2021–2022 school year to guide them in work with their LEA transition teams.
- June 2022 Postsecondary Transition Institute: Delivered in an in-person learning environment. LEAs participated in the sessions with their postsecondary transition teams. Approximately 256 people participated across two days, representing 25 LEAs with partnering agencies participating from around Utah. The second day was open to anyone working with postsecondary transition age youth who's not a member of an existing team. Of the 256 total participants, 49 attended only this day of the Institute, representing multiple agencies and LEAs.
- Building Meaningful Lives: Training to build capacity in LEAs and create a statewide CoP 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 CoP workshops were held during the school year and included 31 participants (educators, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and parents).
- The Utah Postsecondary Transition Team (UPTT) (formerly the Capacity Building Institute Team): This inter-agency state team annually attends the NTACT:C CBI and develops and incorporates tools and PL for LEA transition teams. During the 2021–2022 school year, the Utah team developed goals to analyze special education enrollment in CTE pathways to examine the level of underrepresentation of students with IEPs in CTE concentration and completion. The team will hold focus groups with exemplary LEAs and develop a TA document for the field to facilitate increased enrollment of students with IEPs in CTE pathways.

INDICATORS 15, 16

The USBE and its dispute resolution contractors participated in quarterly mediation, due process, State complaint, and IEP facilitator workgroups hosted by TAESE.

Intro – Broad Stakeholder Input

Intro – 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 SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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

48

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 USEAP, UPC staff, and Utah Parent Teacher Association (PTA) leadership.

Data is shared with USEAP, UPC staff, PTA, and online annually. USEAP often bases priorities on the information provided from the SPP/APR. Comments and feedback are always requested and responded to.

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 USEAP and UPC staff ways to reach out to and connect with parents who are traditionally underrepresented in the stakeholder feedback collection process. Members of 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 were shared with LEA special education leaders, USEAP, UPC staff, 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.

There were no proposed changes to the FFY 2021 SPP/APR that required notification to the public.

Intro – Reporting to the Public

Intro – How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, 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 special

education website (<https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting?mid=5342&tid=1>).

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 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 special education website (<https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting?mid=5342&tid=1>) and is made available for posting on LEA websites. The results of the FFY 2021 APR will be reported to the Utah State Board of Education in the March 2023 Board meeting.

Intro – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro – OSEP Response

The State did not describe the mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and subsequent revisions that the State made to those targets. Specifically, the State did not report a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents.

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 ED Facts 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020–2021), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	71.48%	72.91%	74.37%	75.86%	67.90%
Data	70.22%	69.36%	69.97%	72.36%	56.34%

1 – Targets

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

1 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and

individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,812
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	160
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	207
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	89
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,428

1 – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3,812	5,696	56.34%	67.90%	66.92%	Did not meet target	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 (Utah Administrative Rule 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 (Utah Administrative Rule R277-705-4.).

An LEA may substitute a student's course requirements for graduation to meet the unique educational needs of a student if 1) the student has a disability and 2) 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 (Utah Administrative Rule 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.

In accordance with Utah Administrative Rule R277-700-6(26), an LEA may modify graduation requirements for an individual student with or without an IEP.

An LEA may modify graduation requirements for an individual student to achieve an appropriate route to student success if the modification:

- a. Is consistent with
 - i. the student's IEP; or
 - ii. SEOP/Plan for College and Career Readiness;
- b. is maintained in the student's file;
- c. includes the parent's signature; and
- d. maintains the integrity and rigor expected for high school graduation, as determined by the Board.

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; Utah Administrative Rule R277-705-5.).

An LEA may award an alternate diploma to a student with a significant cognitive disability if 1) the student accesses grade-level core standards through the Essential Elements (Utah's alternate achievement standards), 2) the student's IEP team makes graduation substitutions in the same content area from a list of alternative courses approved by the USBE, and 3) the student meets all graduation requirements prior to exiting school at or before age 22. An Alternate Diploma may not indicate the recipient is a student with a disability.

The USBE provides a list of alternative courses that may be considered for students with 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.

For additional information, the USBE graduation requirements are outlined in Utah Administrative Rule [R277-700-6](#), and Utah Administrative Rule [R277-705](#). The [USBE Special Education Services Graduation Guidelines for Students with Disabilities](#) outlines the process for amending graduation requirements (https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/_specialeducation/_secondarytransitionandgraduation/_guidelines/TransitionGraduationGuidelines.pdf).

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)

The prepopulated EDFacts data above are incorrect. The correct data are:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) = 3,657
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) = 158
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) = 200
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) = 86
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) = 1,309

The prepopulated FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data above are incorrect. The correct data are:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma = 3,657
- Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14–21) = 5,410

The FFY 2020 Data is also prepopulated incorrectly. The correct data is 71.10%. The FFY 2021 Data is 67.60%.

1 – Reasons for Slippage

COVID-19 impacts on credit completion toward graduation (see below for additional explanation). Many LEAs implemented a “no fail” policy for seniors in 2020 when schools experienced soft closures due to COVID-19. This may have slightly inflated graduation rates for 2020 and is now reflected in a slippage for 2021. Moving forward, we will use the “why x 5” root

cause analysis strategy to examine historical credit completion data of students with disabilities to test this hypothesis.

Utah's Alternate Diploma for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are not counted in Indicator 1 graduation calculations. Utah had 158 students earn the Alternate Diploma in FFY 2021.

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 guidance in April 2020 to help LEAs support students toward graduation. Anecdotal evidence from LEAs suggested that despite LEAs efforts to sustain credit completion levels, students still struggled to achieve credit completion toward graduation. This impacted all grade levels. As such, we expect to see impacts on graduation rates for at least four years while students in grades 9 or higher from 2020 are progressing through their high school careers.

The Indicator 1 calculation at the time the FFY 2018 APR was due was 69.97%, with 3,292 students in the numerator and 4,705 students in the denominator.

More detail about the 2018 calculation based on the new calculation (based on EDFacts FS009):

- Looking more closely at the FFY 2018 Indicator 1 rate recalculated based on the FFY 2020 calculation, the numerator of 3,544 includes all students age 14–21 with an IEP in the 2017–2018 school year who exited by graduating with a regular high school diploma. The denominator of 5,222 includes all students age 14–21 with an IEP in the 2017–2018 school year who exited special education with a regular high school diploma, alternate diploma, or certificate of completion; or by dropping out, aging out, or transferring to regular placement.
- Comparing the two calculations, the new calculation includes more students in both the numerator and denominator. The four-year cohort graduation rate for SWD is only based on students in their cohort year, and as such, any one student will only ever be included in a cohort rate once (for their last exit status from between their first entry into high school and their cohort year). The EDFacts FS009 exiter file, on the other hand, can potentially include students every year they are enrolled between ages 14 and 21 if their final exit status each year meets the definitions of the EDFacts FS009 exiter types and their eligibility for FAPE has not ended. The number of graduates in the EDFacts FS009 exiter file can also be higher than the graduation count in the cohort rate since, in addition to students who graduated in their cohort year, it can include students who received their regular high school diploma before or after their cohort year. Due to the fundamental differences between the old and new Indicator 1 rates it was necessary, for baseline and target setting purposes, to recalculate indicator 1 graduation rates for prior years using the updated calculation.

1 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 – OSEP Response

The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma are not different from the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. However, the State reports in its narrative that "[a]n LEA may

substitute a student's course requirements for graduation to meet the unique educational needs of a student if 1) the student has a disability and 2) the substitutions to the student's graduation requirements are made through the student's individual IEP." The State must address this discrepancy.

OSEP notes the State reported, "The prepopulated EDFacts data above are incorrect" and provided alternate data for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in the narrative for Indicator 1. However, OSEP reminds the State that the SY 2020–21 Exiting Data were finalized by OSEP on May 25, 2022.

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

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

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

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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020–2021), and compare the results to the target.

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.

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.

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.

2 - Indicator Data

2 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	25.81%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	36.00%	34.20%	32.49%	30.86%	25.81%
Data	27.69%	27.04%	25.75%	23.56%	17.27%

2 – Targets

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

2 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,812
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	160
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	207
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	89
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,428

2 – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1,428	5,696	17.27%	25.81%	25.07%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Utah identifies dropouts in two ways: 1) The student did not complete the school year and exited as a dropout (left with an exit reason of Unknown, Withdrawn, Dropout, Expelled, Moved but is not known to be continuing in another educational program, Transferred to Adult Education, Exited to Take the Graduation Educational Development (GED), or exited with a Graduation Pending status for which graduation requirements were not completed by September 30 of the following school year); 2) The student ended the school year with the expectation the student would return to school the next year, but the student was not enrolled by September 30 of the following school year (summer dropouts).

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 ED Facts Data above are incorrect for FFY 2021. The correct data are:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) = 3,657
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) = 158
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) = 200
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) = 86
- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) = 1,309

The prepopulated FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data above are incorrect. The correct data are:

- Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out = 1,309
- Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) = 5,410

The FFY 2020 Data is also prepopulated incorrectly. The correct data is 21.56%. The FFY 2021 Data is 24.20%.

The USBE SES 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 SES training and TA documents, as well as individually when needed.

The baseline data is reflective of the new form of measurement used for dropout determinations based on ED Facts File FS009 and does not include "deceased" in the denominator. It is different than the historical data for FFY 2018 which is based on the old

measurement format. During the 2021 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 current calculation was applied to the FFY 2018 data to be consistent with the calculation used for the FFY 2021 dropout rate.

The USBE SES reported a baseline of 25.80% for FFY 2018 in the narrative regarding stakeholder input in its FFY 2020 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 this SPP/APR submission.

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 guidance in April 2020 to help LEAs support students toward graduation. Anecdotal evidence from LEAs suggested that despite LEAs efforts to sustain credit completion levels, students still struggled to achieve credit completion toward graduation. This impacted all grade levels. As such, we expect to see impacts on graduation and dropout rates for at least four years while students in grades nine or higher from 2020 are progressing through their high school careers.

2 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 – OSEP Response

OSEP notes the State reported, "The prepopulated EDFacts data above are incorrect" and provided alternate data for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in the narrative for Indicator 2. However, OSEP reminds the State that the SY 2020-21 Exiting Data were finalized by OSEP on May 25, 2022.

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 ED Facts 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 Web site where these data are reported.

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

3A – Indicator Data

3A – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	90.64%

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

3A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3A – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

3A – Reading Assessment Date

04/05/2023

3A – Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*			5,891
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			3,473
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations			647
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			454

3A – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups – Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

3A – Math Assessment Date

04/05/2023

3A – Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*			5,881
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			3,202

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations			591
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			456

* = 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 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			90.64%	95.00%		Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8			81.14%	95.00%		Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,574	5,891	68.40%	95.00%	77.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

3A – FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			90.21%	95.00%		Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8			77.45%	95.00%		Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	4,249	5,881	65.24%	95.00%	72.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.

Utah’s regular assessments include the Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) assessment for grades 4 and 8 and the Utah Aspire Plus assessment for grade 10. Each school’s overall participation rates for regular assessments are posted on their individual school report cards available on [Utah's School Report Card](https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/) website (<https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/>).

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, the most recent school year’s data will be linked to an Excel spreadsheet.

- The “Participation by Assessment Type” tab reports the number of students with disabilities tested, the participation percentage of students with disabilities in the regular assessment (without accommodations), the participation percent of students with disabilities in the regular assessment with accommodations, and the participation percent of students with disabilities in the alternate assessment at the state, LEA, and school levels.
- The “Notes” tab outlines the USBE’s policy for protecting students’ personally identifiable information. The policy includes protecting data for groups with fewer than 10 students by reporting it as “n<10.” Additionally, for groups with fewer than 40 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 data for Indicator 3 is incorrect as the data submitted to ED Facts on 12/21/2022 was the prior year’s data. New files with the correct FFY 2021 data were submitted on 01/04/2023. The correct data, submitted on 01/04/2023, and any slippage reasons are outlined in [Utah APR FFY 2021 Indicator 3 Correct Data and Slippage Reasons](https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmS-rC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE) (https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmS-rC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE). As discussed with the OSEP State Lead, the linked document was accurate and continues to be accurate.

Utah did not meet the targets for participation in FFY 2021. However, Utah did increase in all areas except math grade 10 as compared with FFY 2020. Reading participation for grade 4 increased by 2.46 percentage points, reading participation for grade 8 increased by 3.83 percentage points, and reading participation for grade 10 increased by 2.06 percentage points. Math participation for grade 4 increased by 2.36 percentage points and math participation for grade eight 8 increased by 4.67 percentage points.

3A – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A – OSEP Response

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 Web site where these data are reported.

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

3B – Indicator Data

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

3B – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3B – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

3B – Reading Assessment Date

04/05/2023

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			4,120
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			211
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			49

3B – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups – Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

3B – Math Assessment Date

04/05/2023

3B – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			3,793
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			182
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			33

3B – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			14.51%	14.51%		Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8			7.31%	7.31%		Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	260	4,120	8.58%	8.58%	6.31%	Did not meet target	Slippage

3B – Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

3B – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			19.74%	19.74%		Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8			6.02%	6.02%		Met target	N/A

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	215	3,793	3.19%	3.19%	5.67%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Utah’s regular assessments include the Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) assessment for grades 4 and 8 and the Utah Aspire Plus assessment for grade 10. Each school’s achievement results for regular assessments are posted on their individual school report cards available on [Utah's School Report Card](https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/) website (https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/).

State-level data can be viewed by clicking the "View State Report" button in the "ABOUT SCHOOL REPORT CARDS" section of the homepage. From the "PERFORMANCE" tab, the grade range can be selected at the top. Additional details for achievement can be viewed by clicking the "View Details" on the "Achievement" tile, then again for each individual subject.

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

The prepopulated data for Indicator 3 is incorrect as the data submitted to EDFacts on 12/21/2022 was the prior year’s data. New files with the correct FFY 2021 data were submitted on 01/04/2023. The correct data, submitted on 01/04/2023, and any slippage reasons are outlined in [Utah APR FFY 2021 Indicator 3 Correct Data and Slippage Reasons](https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmS-) (https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmS-

rC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE). As discussed with the OSEP State Lead, the linked document was accurate and continues to be accurate.

Utah met targets for proficiency on the regular assessment for all areas except reading for grade 10.

3B – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B – OSEP Response

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 Web site where these data are reported.

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

3C - Indicator Data

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

3C – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3C – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

3C – Reading Assessment Date

04/05/2023

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			454
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient			109

3C – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups – Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

3C – Math Assessment Date

04/05/2023

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			456

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient			76

3C – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			15.06%	15.06%		Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8			23.74%	23.74%		Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	109	454	29.43%	29.43%	24.01%	Did not meet target	Slippage

3C – Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

3C – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			31.43%	31.43%		Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8			6.24%	6.24%		Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	76	456	12.41%	12.41%	16.67%	Met target	No Slippage

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 students with disabilities on Utah's alternate assessment, Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), for grades 4, 8, and 10 are reported on the [USB E Data and Statistics Reports](#) webpage. On the "Assessments" tab under the "Alternate Assessments" header, the most recent school year's data will be linked to an Excel spreadsheet.

- The "Proficiency by Subject Area" tab reports the proficiency of students with disabilities who participated in the alternate assessment, a comparison to the proficiency of students with disabilities who participated in the regular assessment, and a comparison to the proficiency of all students who participated in the regular assessment by subject area.
- The "Proficiency by Grade Level" tab reports the proficiency of students with disabilities who participated in the alternate assessment, a comparison to the proficiency of students with disabilities who participated in the regular assessment, and a comparison to the proficiency of all students who participated in the regular assessment by grade level.
- The "Notes" tab outlines the USB E's policy for protecting students' personally identifiable information. The policy includes protecting data for groups with fewer than 10 students by reporting it as "n<10." Additionally, for groups with fewer than 40 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)

The prepopulated data for Indicator 3 is incorrect as the data submitted to ED Facts on 12/21/2022 was the prior year's data. New files with the correct FFY 2021 data were submitted on 01/04/2023. The correct data, submitted on 01/04/2023, and any slippage reasons are outlined in [Utah APR FFY 2021 Indicator 3 Correct Data and Slippage Reasons](https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmSrC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE) (https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmSrC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE). As discussed with the OSEP State Lead, the linked document was accurate and continues to be accurate.

Utah met targets for proficiency on the alternate assessment for reading and math for grades 8 and 10. Utah did not meet targets for grade 4.

3C – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C – OSEP Response

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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.31	23.19	23.07	22.84	22.36
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.63	35.51	35.39	35.15	34.67
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	39.47	39.23	38.99	38.51	37.55
Math	A <=	Grade 4	25.22	25.10	24.98	24.74	24.25
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.51	30.43	30.35	30.19	29.86
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.62	25.52	25.42	25.23	24.83

3D – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3D – Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

3D – Date

04/05/2023

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			45,712
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			4,120
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			18,163
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			89
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			211

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			49

3D – Data Source

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

3D – Date

04/05/2023

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			45,735
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			3,793
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			17,282
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			61
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			182
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			33

3D – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			23.31	23.31		Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8			35.63	35.63		Did not meet target	N/A

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	6.31%	39.93%	39.47	39.47	33.62	Met target	No Slippage

3D – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			25.22	25.22		Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8			30.51	30.51		Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	5.67%	37.92%	25.62	25.62	32.25	Did not meet target	Slippage

3D – Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

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

The prepopulated data for Indicator 3 is incorrect as the data submitted to EDFacts on 12/21/2022 was the prior year's data. New files with the correct FFY 2021 data were submitted on 01/04/2023. The correct data, submitted on 01/04/2023, and any slippage reasons are outlined in [Utah APR FFY 2021 Indicator 3 Correct Data and Slippage Reasons](https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmS-rC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE) (https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/ER7TDoqZrR1MmY-rmS-rC1wBiEyWfEaqxYvAG7sXrIIHIA?e=vl8BoE). As discussed with the OSEP State Lead, the linked document was accurate and continues to be accurate.

Utah met gap targets for reading for grades 8 and 10, as well as math for grade 10. Utah did not meet targets for reading for grade 4, or for math for grades 4 and 8, though Utah did increase proficiency for students with disabilities in these areas in FFY 2021. However, all students'

proficiency increased which made it challenging for Utah to meet all targets and not have slippage in gap.

3D – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D – OSEP Response

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

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020–2021), 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 2020–2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021–2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021–2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020–2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020–2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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
2021	18.18%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

4A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 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.

145

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2	11	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	N/A	N/A

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 2021 (school year (SY) 2020–2021) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than 10 days was 0.0542%. The USBE set the State bar as five times the State rate. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 0.27% or more of its students with disabilities for more than 10 days was identified for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 10 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator and two students in the numerator. Of the 156 LEAs in SY 2020–2021, 22 had students with disabilities who were suspended for more than 10 days and 134 did not have any students with disabilities who were suspended for more than 10 days. Of the 22 LEAs who had students with disabilities who were suspended for more than 10 days, 11 LEAs met the minimum n/cell sizes and 11 LEAs did not. Across the entire state, 47 students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2020–2021.

The USBE arrived at the count of 145 LEAs excluded from the calculation through two processes of elimination:

- 134 LEAs are excluded due to not having any students with disabilities suspended more than 10 days (does not meet the minimum cell size).
- 11 LEAs are excluded due to not meeting the combination of minimum n and cell sizes.

The total out-of-school suspensions/expulsions within an LEA during a school year is calculated by summing up all out-of-school removals (10% of the day or longer). Students with disabilities with > 10 total days of out-of-school removals are identified. The USBE compares the LEA rate to the State rate. A significant discrepancy occurs when the LEA's rate equals or exceeds five times the State rate. The target is 0% of LEAs with a significant discrepancy.

As 4A is a results indicator, all LEAs identified for significant discrepancy are included in the numerator regardless of the result of their review of policies, procedures, and practices.

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

The USBE worked directly with the IDC to improve and update the Indicator 4 process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. The change in the calculation method from five percentage points higher than the State rate (which would have made the State bar 5.05%) to five times the state rate (which makes the State bar 0.27%) led to an increase in LEAs identified. An LEA self-assessment of policies, procedures, and practices in regards to suspension and expulsion was conducted on the FFY 2021 data. This process increases the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate. Two LEAs were identified for Indicator 4A in FFY 2021. The process of correction and verification is in process.

4A – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.

LEAs who were identified as having a significant discrepancy were required to conduct a self-assessment of policies procedures and practices. The self-assessment included a review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices, as well as individual student record reviews regarding discipline procedures taken. The self-assessments were submitted to the USBE for determination of compliance.

The two LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy submitted self-assessments and were both identified as noncompliant. Documentation of manifestation determinations, parent

receipt of Procedural Safeguards, and attempts to address student behavior were not documented, and findings of noncompliance were issued.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

4A – If YES, select one of the following:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

4A – The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

The USBE has not completed the process to ensure LEA policies, procedures, and practices have been revised. The USBE will ensure LEA policies, procedures and practices are revised. This will be verified through the correction of findings of noncompliance in which the USBE will verify that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected and each LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements. The completion of this process will be reported in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

OSEP notes that the State reported it did not ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. The State reported "The completion of this process will be reported in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR".

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State's methodology for examining data must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State's methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State included 7.1 percent of its LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

Additionally, the Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State's methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States that use a rate ratio.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020–2021), 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 2020–2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020–2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021–2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020–2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020–2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

4B – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

4B – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

4B – FFY 2021 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.

147

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	9	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 2021 (school year (SY) 2020–2021) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than 10 days was 0.0542%. The USBE set the State bar as five times the State rate. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 0.27% or more of its students with disabilities, in a specific racial/ethnic group, for more than 10 days was identified for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 10 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator and two students in the numerator for each racial/ethnic group. Of the 156 LEAs in SY 2020-2021, 9 had students with disabilities who were suspended for more than 10 days and met the minimum n/cell sizes for at least one racial/ethnic group, 13 had students with disabilities who were suspended for more than 10 days but did not meet the minimum n/cell sizes for any racial/ethnic groups, and 134 did not have any students with disabilities who were suspended for more than 10 days. Across the entire state, 47 students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2020-2021.

The total out-of-school suspensions/expulsions within an LEA during a school year is calculated by summing up all out-of-school removals (10% of the day or longer). Students with disabilities with > 10 total days of out-of-school removals are identified. The USBE compares the LEA rate to the State rate. A significant discrepancy occurs when the LEA’s rate equals or exceeds five times the State rate. The target is 0% of LEAs with a significant discrepancy.

As 4B is a compliance indicator, all LEAs identified for significant discrepancy are included in the numerator regardless if the result of the review of policies, procedures, and practices reflects compliance.

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

The USBE worked directly with the IDC to improve and update the Indicator 4 process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. An LEA self-assessment of policies, procedures, and practices in regards to suspension and expulsion was conducted on the FFY 2021 data. This process increases the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate. No LEAs were identified for Indicator 4B in FFY 2021.

OSEP asked the USBE to clarify whether, in circumstances where the USBE 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 USBE has not identified noncompliance with Indicator 4B that has required verification of correction and the issuance of findings.

- If the USBE had identified noncompliance for Indicator 4B, and had been unable to verify correction within the three-week window, the USBE would have issued findings for all areas below 100% compliant.
- The USBE previously used a three-week window for correction before issuing findings of noncompliance. This is no longer a part of our policies, procedures, or practices. Written findings of noncompliance are issued for all areas below 100% compliant within 90 days of identification.

4B – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2021. If an LEA had been identified, it would have been required to conduct a self-assessment of policies, procedures and practices. The self-assessment would have included a review of the LEA’s discipline policies, procedures, and practices, as well as individual student record reviews regarding discipline practices taken for students in the identified racial/ethnic group(s), IEPs, and Procedural Safeguards. The self-assessment would have been submitted to the USBE for determination of compliance, the need for correction, and verification of implementation of regulatory requirements.

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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

None

4B – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State’s methodology for examining data must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State’s methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State included 5.8 percent of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Additionally, OSEP notes that the State’s chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States that use a rate ratio.

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	58.09%	58.53%	58.97%	59.41%	65.12%
A	Data	61.57%	63.47%	65.12%	67.84%	70.54%
B	Target <=	13.36%	13.29%	13.22%	13.15%	9.71%
B	Data	10.68%	10.26%	9.71%	9.13%	8.43%
C	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.78%
C	Data	2.61%	2.63%	2.67%	2.58%	2.68%

5 – Targets

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

5 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	81,520
SY 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58,801
SY 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,879
SY 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,946
SY 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	12
SY 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	110

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58,801	81,520	70.54%	65.12%	72.13%	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	6,879	81,520	8.43%	9.71%	8.44%	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]	2,068	81,520	2.68%	2.78%	2.54%	Met target	No Slippage

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

5 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 – OSEP Response

5 – Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

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 = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.

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

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

6A, 6B – Historical Data

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	33.62%	33.82%	36.32%	36.52%	46.86%
A	Data	37.19%	39.90%	48.09%	52.05%	50.69%
B	Target <=	43.16%	42.96%	41.35%	41.15%	32.67%
B	Data	38.36%	34.68%	28.50%	29.76%	31.14%

6 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	46.86%	47.75%	48.65%	50.43%	54.00%
Target B <=	32.67%	32.34%	32.00%	31.34%	30.00%

6C – Inclusive Targets

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

6 – Prepopulated Data

6 – Data Source

SY 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

6 – Date

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,569	3,668	1,074	7,311
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	1,168	1,925	616	3,709
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	937	1,004	270	2,211
b2. Number of children attending separate school	43	50	11	104
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	6	12	2	20

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	3,709	7,311	50.69%	46.86%	50.73%	Met target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,315	7,311	31.14%	32.67%	31.66%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	20	7,311	0.31%	0.31%	0.27%	Met target	No Slippage

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 2021 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 the historical data excluding five-year-old kindergartners and the projections for where the State would be in 2025–2026 if all things stayed the same. Choosing baselines in a year prior to COVID-19 reflects Utah student abilities in a typical school year and was determined to be an appropriate baseline.

6 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 – OSEP Response

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 = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

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.

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

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	Target >=	91.12%	91.32%	95.10%	95.30%	88.86%
A1	Data	87.97%	89.28%	88.86%	89.18%	91.49%
A2	Target >=	51.80%	52.00%	52.93%	53.13%	55.80%
A2	Data	59.41%	61.26%	58.94%	57.20%	57.83%
B1	Target >=	90.56%	90.76%	93.21%	93.41%	88.41%
B1	Data	86.93%	88.34%	88.41%	90.04%	92.26%
B2	Target >=	45.39%	45.59%	48.71%	48.91%	48.48%
B2	Data	51.79%	53.64%	50.48%	48.70%	49.86%
C1	Target >=	91.30%	91.50%	93.92%	94.12%	89.86%
C1	Data	88.87%	90.83%	89.86%	89.68%	92.23%
C2	Target >=	63.57%	63.77%	67.21%	67.41%	66.44%
C2	Data	71.57%	71.68%	70.52%	66.95%	68.44%

7 – Targets

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

7 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

3,384

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	5	0.15%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	393	11.61%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,321	39.04%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,371	40.51%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	294	8.69%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,692	3,090	91.49%	88.86%	87.12%	Did not meet target	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,665	3,384	57.83%	55.80%	49.20%	Did not meet target	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	8	0.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	352	10.40%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,688	49.88%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,252	37.00%

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	84	2.48%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,940	3,300	92.26%	88.41%	89.09%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,336	3,384	49.86%	48.48%	39.48%	Did not meet target	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	16	0.47%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	398	11.76%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,150	33.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,487	43.94%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	333	9.84%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,637	3,051	92.23%	89.86%	86.43%	Did not meet target	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,820	3,384	68.44%	66.44%	53.78%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	Fewer students were included in the denominator due to a decline in the number of students exiting the program. The launch of a new data collection system may have also had an impact.
A2	Fewer students were included in the denominator due to a decline in the number of students exiting the program. The launch of a new data collection system may have also had an impact.
B2	Fewer students were included in the denominator due to a decline in the number of students exiting the program. The launch of a new data collection system may have also had an impact.
C1	Fewer students were included in the denominator due to a decline in the number of students exiting the program. The launch of a new data collection system may have also had an impact.
C2	Fewer students were included in the denominator due to a decline in the number of students exiting the program. The launch of a new data collection system may have also had an impact.

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. Within UPIPS is a 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 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 2021 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 for FFY 2021 were impacted by the launch of a new data collection system. Indicator 7 data continues to be collected in the UPIPS online program, specifically in the UPOD section of the program. A new UPIPS program was launched at the start of FFY 2021. Several new features impacted the UPOD section of the program. The new UPIPS program connects to the SEA's student data clearinghouse. Student data is populated into the UPIPS system through a connection with the data clearinghouse. There were a few issues at the beginning of the 2021–2022 school year as information was transferred from the old UPIPS program to the new one. These issues have been resolved but may have impacted data collection for FFY 2021. Although LEAs received training on using the new UPOD system and ongoing support was provided, the change of data collection systems may have impacted Indicator 7 data for FFY 2021.

Initially, our internal reporting system calculated incorrect data for the number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who were assessed (3,403). This number has now been corrected to 3,384 above.

7 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 – OSEP Response

The State reported 3384 as the denominator in its calculation of the percent preschool children aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. However, the State reported 3403 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs were assessed. The State must explain this discrepancy.

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 = $[(\# \text{ of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of respondent parents of children with disabilities})] \times 100$.

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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 must

consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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

8 – Indicator Data

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

8 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	79.52%	79.62%	80.52%	81.33%	78.38%
Data	76.82%	79.65%	78.38%	78.84%	78.56%

8 – Targets

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

8 – FFY 2021 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	FFY	FFY	Status	Slippage
		2020 Data	2021 Target	2021 Data		
1,526	1,905	78.56%	78.38%	80.10%	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

7,419

8 – Percentage of respondent parents

25.68%

8 – Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	31.91%	25.68%

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

The USBE is 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 third year the survey had a digital option for families who provided an email address and whose primary language was 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 mailing of the paper surveys included the following languages and quantities: English (991), Spanish (131), Arabic (4), Farsi (1), Vietnamese (4), and Marshallese (4). The online survey was sent in English (5595) and Spanish (636).

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 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 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

The USBE 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.

The USBE 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.

Nonresponse bias is likely not an issue with respect to the variables the USBE examined.

8 – Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. 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.

The USBE used statistical significance testing of response rates to determine if one racial/ethnic group was over-or under-represented. Note that our survey sample was such that if all racial/ethnic groups had the same response rate, this would be representative of the demographics of students receiving special education services. For example, if all racial/ethnic groups had a 30% response rate, the demographics of the responding parents would be representative of the demographics of students receiving special education services. Whereas, if one racial/ethnic group had a 30% response rate and another had a 20% response rate, the demographics of the responding parents would not be representative of students receiving special education services.

Response rates by race/ethnicity for FFY 2021:

- African American/Black: 23%
- Asian: 26%
- Hispanic: 15%
- Multiracial; 31%
- Native American: 22%
- Pacific Islander: 16%
- White: 29%

Percent of parents that met the involvement score by race/ethnicity for FFY 2021:

- African American/Black: 39%
- Asian: 90%
- Hispanic: 81%
- Multiracial: 79%
- Native American: 96%
- Pacific Islander: 99%
- White: 80%

The USBE is continually working to increase efforts to engage responses from parents in the Hispanic and Pacific Islander communities. Additional analysis and investigation into students and parents who are African American/Black will help identify strategies to increase participation from this community as well.

Response rates by student disability category for FFY 2021:

- Autism: 34%
- Emotional Disturbance: 27%
- Deafblindness: 20%
- Developmental Delay: 24%

- Hard of Hearing/Deafness: 26%
- Intellectual Disability: 29%
- Multiple Disabilities: 28%
- Orthopedic Impairment: 31%
- Other Health Impairment: 31%
- Specific Learning Disabilities: 21%
- Speech Language Impairment: 27%
- Traumatic Brain Injury: 30%
- Visual Impairment (Including Blindness): 22%

Percent of parents that met the involvement score by student disability category for FFY 2021:

- Autism: 81%
- Emotional Disturbance: 89%
- Deafblindness: 0%
- Developmental Delay: 89%
- Hard of Hearing/Deafness: 89%
- Intellectual Disability: 81%
- Multiple Disabilities: 77%
- Orthopedic Impairment: 0%
- Other Health Impairment: 69%
- Specific Learning Disabilities: 78%
- Speech Language Impairment: 83%
- Traumatic Brain Injury: 0%
- Visual Impairment (Including Blindness): 0%

Parents of students with specific learning disabilities show a low response rate and low involvement score. Further steps will be taken to investigate any specific areas to focus efforts to improve response rates and involvement in the process. Consideration for low incident disabilities (e.g, deafblindness, traumatic brain injury) will also be considered.

Although there are a few significant differences in response rates between groups of parents by race/ethnicity and disability category, 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 Multiracial students. In addition, parents from a wide range of LEAs across the state responded to the survey. While we are confident the overall results are representative of the State as a whole despite the differences in response rates, they are not representative of the demographics of students receiving special education services in the State.

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 the 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 rates 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. 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 of at least 20% or until the survey closes.

The USBE made the survey available in a digital format for the third 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 which produced 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.

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.	

8 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 – Prior FFY 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.

8 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

OSEP required the following action in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR:

“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.”

The USBE responded to this requirement in the sections above, including:

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

- 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.
- Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. 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.

If additional or more specific information is needed, please request it during the clarification period.

8 - OSEP Response

OSEP’s response to the State’s FFY2020 SPP/APR required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The State submitted a response to feedback received, and an evaluation of the submitted information indicated that it could yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State must incorporate this information into its sampling plan and submit the revised sampling plan with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

8 - Required Actions

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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

9 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	1.44%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	0.00%	0.00%

9 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

9 – FFY 2021 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, 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.

17

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
10	2	139	0.00%	0%	1.44%	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 a weighted risk ratio of 3.00 or above. One year of data is used for this calculation. For all analysis group and comparison group calculations, the minimum cell size (the numerator) is five, and the minimum n-size (the denominator) is 10.

Using school year (SY) 2021–2022 data, the USBE SES calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group in each LEA in the State based on the identification rates in each of 156 LEAs. Of these 156 LEAs, 139 met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final weighted risk ratio. If an LEA's weighted risk ratio exceeded the 3.00 threshold for racial/ethnic

groups that had five or more students with disabilities (cell size) and 10 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA with the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups combined) also having five or more students with disabilities (cell size) and 10 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA, the LEA was identified for disproportionate representation.

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

All LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation were required to complete a pilot self-assessment to determine if the disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification. This included a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to referral, evaluation, and eligibility determination, as well as individual student record reviews regarding evaluation and eligibility determination measures taken for students in the flagged group(s). LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification when any level of noncompliance was identified by the USBE SES during the review of their self-assessments. The LEAs were also issued written findings of noncompliance. The findings identified the specific area(s) the LEAs were noncompliant in and provided corresponding regulation. The LEAs have been required to revise policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the development and implementation of eligibility and IEP documents. Within one year of identification, all corrections will be verified through individual student file reviews to ensure 100% compliance. To determine whether the LEAs are subsequently implementing regulatory requirements, the USBE SES will review a sample of additional student files and will provide training as necessary. The USBE SES will report on the findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

9 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE SES worked directly with IDC to improve and update the Indicator 9 process. The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. As part of the process change, the USBE SES developed a pilot self-assessment that LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation were required to complete.

OSEP previously asked the USBE SES to clarify whether, in circumstances where the USBE SES 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 USBE SES has not identified noncompliance with Indicator 9 that has required verification of correction and the issuance of findings.
- If the USBE SES had identified noncompliance for Indicator 9, and had been unable to verify correction within the three-week window, the USBE SES would have issued findings for all areas below 100% compliant.

- The USBE SES previously used a three-week window for correction before issuing findings of noncompliance. This is no longer a part of our policies, procedures, or practices. Written findings of noncompliance are issued for all areas below 100% compliant within 90 days of identification.

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

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.

9 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

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 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 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

10 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	5.69%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	0.00%	0.00%

10 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

10 – FFY 2021 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.

33

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
37	7	123	0.00%	0%	5.69%	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 a weighted risk ratio of 3.00 or above. One year of data is used for this calculation. For all analysis group and comparison group calculations the minimum cell size (the numerator) is five, and the minimum n size (the denominator) is 10.

Using school year (SY) 2021–2022 data, the USBE SES calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group and disability category combination in each LEA in the State based on the identification rates in each of 156 LEAs. 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. However, 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.

Of the 156 LEAs in Utah in SY 2021–2022, 123 met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final weighted risk ratio. If an LEA's weighted risk ratio exceeded the 3.00 threshold for a target racial/ethnic group that had five or more students in a specific disability category (cell size) and 10 or more students with disabilities of the target racial/ethnic group enrolled (n-size) in the LEA with the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups in the specific disability category) also having five or more students (cell size) and 10 or more total students of the target racial/ethnic group enrolled (n-size) in the LEA, the LEA was identified for disproportionate representation.

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.

All LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation were required to complete a pilot self-assessment to determine if the disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification. This included a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to referral, evaluation, and eligibility determination, as well as individual student record reviews regarding evaluation and eligibility determination measures taken for students in the flagged combination(s). LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification when any level of noncompliance was identified by the USBE SES during the review of their self-assessments. The LEAs were also issued written findings of noncompliance. The findings identified the specific area(s) the LEAs were noncompliant in and provided corresponding regulation. The LEAs have been required to revise policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the development and implementation of eligibility and IEP documents. Within one year of identification, all corrections will be verified through individual

student file reviews to ensure 100% compliance. To determine whether the LEAs are subsequently implementing regulatory requirements, the USBE SES will review a sample of additional student files and will provide training as necessary. The USBE SES will report on the findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

10 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE SES worked directly with IDC to improve and update the Indicator 10 process. The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. As part of the process change, the USBE SES developed a pilot self-assessment that LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation were required to complete.

OSEP previously asked the USBE SES to clarify whether, in circumstances where the USBE SES 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 USBE SES has not identified noncompliance with Indicator 10 that has required verification of correction and the issuance of findings.
- If the USBE SES had identified noncompliance for Indicator 10, and had been unable to verify correction within the three-week window, the USBE SES would have issued findings for all areas below 100% compliant.
- The USBE SES previously used a three-week window for correction before issuing findings of noncompliance. This is no longer a part of our policies, procedures, or practices. Written findings of noncompliance are issued for all areas below 100% compliant within 90 days of identification.

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

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.

10 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

10 – OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 – Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.60%	100.00%	96.21%	97.10%	97.44%

11 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

11 – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
692	666	97.44%	100%	96.24%	Did not meet target	Slippage

11 – Provide reasons for slippage

The slippage can be associated with fewer files reviewed during the monitoring year aligned with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. For FFY 2020, the USBE SES reviewed 782 files across 79 LEAs with noncompliance identified in 20 files. For the FFY 2021, the USBE SES reviewed 692 files across 95 LEAs with noncompliance identified in 26 files. There was slightly more noncompliance identified across fewer files reviewed for FFY 2021 than FFY 2020.

The USBE SES collects data for Indicator 11 using two types of monitoring: 1) full monitoring and 2) Indicator 11 monitoring.

- The data collected through full monitoring is mostly likely the reason for the decreased number of files reviewed and higher levels of noncompliance identified. Full monitoring includes a review of the student's entire special education record and files are selected by the USBE SES. The number of files selected for a full monitoring review is based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and may include a small number of initial evaluations completed within a year prior to the visit. The total number of files reviewed during full monitoring visits varies based on the size of the LEAs reviewed each year.
- Indicator 11 monitoring is a review of the initial evaluation timeline only. LEAs are asked to choose 10 files for review.

The USBE SES conducted full monitoring in 15 LEAs for FFY 2020 and 30 LEAs for FFY 2021. Although more LEAs were visited for FFY 2021, the size of the LEAs impacts the number of files reviewed at each school site. In FFY 2020, the USBE SES reviewed an average of 17.31 student files for initial evaluation at each LEA. In FFY 2021, the USBE SES reviewed an average of 6.27 student files for initial evaluation at each LEA. As the USBE SES randomly selects the files for full monitoring visits, the likelihood of identifying noncompliance is higher with these LEAs than when the LEA selects their own files for an Indicator 11 monitoring visit. LEAs do not receive a full monitoring visit and a separate Indicator 11 visit in the same year.

11 – Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

26

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-six student files across 16 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 (Rules) II.D.3. (e.g., repeated failure to produce the student, enrolling in the school after the timeframe has begun). The number of days beyond the timeline ranged from 29 to 529. Timelines were delayed due to LEAs incorrectly obtaining consent, failure to complete all assessments for which consent was received, failure to document when evaluations were completed, and COVID-19 barriers. Of the 26 files, 19 lacked documentation for the reason for delay, four had noncompliance identified with consents or evaluation, three listed COVID-19 as the reason for delay. The USBE reviewed 692 student records for initial evaluation across 95 LEAs. Of the 692 evaluations completed, six student files across five LEAs have initial evaluations completed after the 45-school-day period but had a compliant reason for delay documented in the file in accordance with Rules II.D.3. These six students were included in (a) and (b).

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).

Rules 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 full monitoring visits and Indicator 11 monitoring visits focused on reviewing files for initial evaluation compliance. All data is entered in the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) online program.

All LEAs will receive a full monitoring visit at least once every six years. LEAs selected for full monitoring visits will be prioritized based on a variety of concerns related to general supervision systems (e.g., concerns with 1%, dispute resolution, Indicator 11 and 13 monitoring, hotline complaints, fiscal, etc.). Full monitoring visits occur onsite at the LEA and include a review of entire student special education records. Files are selected by the USBE SES. The number of files selected for a full monitoring review is based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and may include a small number of postsecondary transition plans. The total number of files reviewed during full monitoring visits varies based on the size of the LEAs reviewed each year. During the visit, the LEA is encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive TA during the review process and all Indicator 11 data that comes from a full monitoring visit is included in the SPP/APR.

Most of the Indicator 11 data is collected during Indicator 11 monitoring visits. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving an Indicator 11 file review biennially. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive an Indicator 11 file monitoring visit 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. The USBE statistician helps compile the cohort list of LEAs to ensure that 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 even/odd years, the first cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey, the second cohort receives an Indicator 11 monitoring visit. In odd/even years, the first cohort receives an Indicator 11 monitoring visit, the second cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey. If an LEA is selected for a full monitoring visit the same year it's cohort is selected for an Indicator 11 monitoring visit, Indicator 11 will be collected during the full monitoring visit. The LEA will not receive a separate Indicator 11 monitoring visit. During an indicator monitoring review, the USBE SES reviews up to 10 initial evaluation timelines for all LEAs regardless of the size of the LEA. The LEA selects which files are reviewed by USBE. Indicator file reviews are

conducted virtually, and the LEA usually will share their screen while a USBE reviewer collects the data for Indicator 11.

11 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Prior to FFY 2022, the USBE SES determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance when they did not correct the individual noncompliance within the State-established correction window.

All individual noncompliance was corrected by showing an additional student file with consent and evaluations to ensure the evaluations were completed within the State-established 45-school day timeline. For LEAs who were issued findings of noncompliance, additional files were also provided by the LEA and verified by the USBE SES as compliant to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. All noncompliance from FFY 2020 and prior were corrected using this process and were verified within 10 months from the date noncompliance was identified.

The USBE SES has reviewed and revised statewide procedures for correcting noncompliance for everything below 100% as follows:

PRONG 1: CORRECTING EACH INDIVIDUAL CASE OF STUDENT-SPECIFIC NONCOMPLIANCE

To correct noncompliance concerning student-specific requirements, the LEA must submit documentation that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student’s special education file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

PRONG 2: CORRECTLY IMPLEMENTING THE SPECIFIC REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

In conjunction with Prong 1 corrections, the LEA will be required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020 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 additional student that was completed within the timeline. For FFY 2020, LEAs were allowed 85 calendar days to correct noncompliance before being issued a written finding of noncompliance. One LEA did not correct noncompliance within the 85 calendar days and was issued a written finding of noncompliance. The LEA corrected the noncompliance for the individual student and demonstrated correct implementation of regulatory requirements by showing two additional student files where evaluations were completed within 45 school days of receiving parent consent for evaluation.

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

The USBE SES verified the one individual case of noncompliance was corrected by ensuring the student evaluation was completed, even though it was outside the timeline and through reviewing additional student files from the same case manager that were completed within the 45-school-day timeline. Through the submission of additional files that were completed within the 45-school-day timeline, the USBE SES was able to verify that subsequent records were 100% compliant and the LEA was correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

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.

11 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

11 – OSEP Response

The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline) of receiving parental consent for the evaluation, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2020 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

11 – Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

12 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	99.62%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.74%	99.84%	99.62%	94.08%	95.76%

12 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

12 – FFY 2021 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.	2,646
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	502
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,999
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.	101
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	27

Measurement	Data
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	1,999	2,016	95.76%	100%	99.16%	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

17

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.

Four of the 17 students served in Part C and to Part B were determined not eligible after their third birthday, and no IEP was developed.

The remaining 13 delays are outlined below:

- LEA 1: Six IEPs were completed late due to the need for additional testing. The range of days beyond the third birthday for these six IEPs was 21 to 84 days. Additionally, 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 three days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 2: One IEP was completed late due to the LEA holding the IEP meeting after the student's third birthday. This IEP was completed three days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 3: 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 29 days after the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 4: One IEP was completed late due to a late transition meeting with Part C. This IEP was completed 11 days after the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool

Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.

- LEA 5: Two IEPs were completed late due to the students having a birthday in the summer when the LEA was not in session. Both IEPs were completed eight days beyond the students' third birthdays. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 6: One IEP was late due to the need for additional testing. This IEP was completed three days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA 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 Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) program 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, 2021, through June 30, 2022. 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 2021 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 impact 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.

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
75	75	0	0

12 – FFY 2020 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 2020, 75 students were not evaluated for Part B prior to their third birthdays. For 51 of the 75 students, 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 of the 75 students were referred to Part B for eligibility determination and were determined not eligible after their third birthday, and no IEP was developed. For the remaining 12 students, delays were not attributed to the COVID-19 school closures. 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 TA to each LEA that was issued findings of noncompliance. Additionally, the USBE Preschool Special Education Specialist reviewed additional files, verified that all additional files were compliant, and that all identified LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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 and, if determined eligible, had an IEP implemented as soon as possible, and, in no case, later than one year. All IEPs were completed by the submission date of the FFY 2020 APR.

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

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.

12 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The USBE SES reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator in the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020" and "FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected" sections of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

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 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 leadership. Additionally, the USBE Preschool Special Education Specialist

reviewed additional files in each identified LEA and verified that regulatory requirements were being correctly implemented. 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, and ensured an IEP was developed and implemented 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 – OSEP Response

12 – Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.07%	88.40%	39.71%	52.10%	69.13%

13 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

13 – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
424	611	69.13%	100%	69.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Indicator 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.

Data for Indicator 13 was collected through full monitoring visits and Indicator 13 monitoring visits focused on reviewing files for compliant postsecondary transition plans. All data is entered in the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) online program.

All LEAs will receive a full monitoring visit at least once every six years. LEAs selected for full monitoring visits will be prioritized based on a variety of concerns related to general supervision systems (e.g., concerns with 1% assessment practices, dispute resolution, Indicator 11 and 13 monitoring, Public Education Hotline complaints, fiscal, etc.). Full monitoring visits occur onsite at the LEA and include a review of entire student special education records. Files are selected by the USBE SES. The number of files selected for a full monitoring review is based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and may include a small number of postsecondary transition plans. The total number of files reviewed during full monitoring visits varies based on the size of the LEAs reviewed each year. During the visit, the LEA is encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive TA during the review process and all Indicator 13 data that comes from a full monitoring visit is included in the SPP/APR.

Most of the Indicator 13 data is collected during Indicator 13 monitoring visits. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving an Indicator 13 file review biennially. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive an Indicator 13 file monitoring visit 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. The USBE statistician helps compile the cohort list of LEAs to ensure that 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 even/odd years, the first cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey, the second cohort receives an Indicator 13 monitoring visit. In odd/even years, the first cohort receives an Indicator 13 monitoring visit, the second cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey. If an LEA is selected for a full monitoring visit the same year it's cohort is selected for an Indicator 13 monitoring visit, Indicator 13 will be collected during the full monitoring visit. The LEA will not receive a separate Indicator 13 monitoring visit. During an indicator monitoring review, the USBE SES reviews up to 10 postsecondary transition plans for all LEAs regardless of the size of the LEA. The LEA selects which files are reviewed by USBE. Indicator file reviews are conducted virtually, and the LEA usually will share their screen while a USBE reviewer collects the data for Indicator 13.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

13 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Prior to FFY 2022, the USBE SES determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance when they did not correct the individual noncompliance within the State-established correction window.

All individual noncompliance was corrected by showing the corrected postsecondary transition plan for the individual student file that was initially identified as noncompliant. For LEAs who were issued findings of noncompliance, additional files were also provided by the LEA and verified by the USBE SES as compliant to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. All noncompliance prior to FFY 2022 were corrected using this process and were verified within 10 months from the date noncompliance was identified.

The USBE SES has reviewed and revised statewide procedures for correcting noncompliance for everything below 100% as follows:

PRONG 1: CORRECTING EACH INDIVIDUAL CASE OF STUDENT-SPECIFIC NONCOMPLIANCE

To correct noncompliance concerning student-specific requirements, the LEA must submit documentation that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student’s special education file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

PRONG 2: CORRECTLY IMPLEMENTING THE SPECIFIC REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

In conjunction with Prong 1 corrections, the LEA will be required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

13 – FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

13 – 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 13 at the time of the review were required to submit additional student files for USBE SES review to ensure the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. The USBE SES verified the subsequent records were 100% compliant and the LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The USBE SES provided technical assistance to LEAs on how to bring each noncompliant postsecondary transition plan into compliance. Upon making corrections, LEAs were required to submit evidence of the now-compliant postsecondary transition plans to the USBE SES for review. The LEAs submitted the required evidence for all noncompliant plans, the USBE SES reviewed all the evidence, and verified that all individual cases of noncompliance had been corrected.

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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

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.

13 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Prior to FFY 2022, the USBE SES determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance when they did not correct the individual noncompliance within the State-established correction window.

All individual noncompliance was corrected by showing an additional student file with consent and evaluations to ensure the evaluations were completed within the State-established 45-school day timeline. For LEAs who were issued findings of noncompliance, additional files were also provided by the LEA and verified by the USBE SES as compliant to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. All noncompliance from FFY 2020 and prior were corrected using this process and were verified within 10 months from the date noncompliance was identified.

The USBE SES has reviewed and revised statewide procedures for correcting noncompliance for everything below 100% as follows:

PRONG 1: CORRECTING EACH INDIVIDUAL CASE OF STUDENT-SPECIFIC NONCOMPLIANCE

To correct noncompliance concerning student-specific requirements, the LEA must submit documentation that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student's special education file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

PRONG 2: CORRECTLY IMPLEMENTING THE SPECIFIC REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

In conjunction with Prong 1 corrections, the LEA will be required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

13 – OSEP Response

The State reported "Prior to FFY 2022, the USBE SES determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements." However, within the narrative the State also reported "All noncompliance from FFY 2020 and prior were corrected

using this process and were verified within 10 months from the date noncompliance was identified." OSEP cannot determine if the correction of noncompliance using the "State-established correction window" took place prior to FFY 2022 or FY 2020. Please clarify.

13 – Required Actions

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 = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

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

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

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.

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s 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. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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. 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.

14 – Indicator Data

14 – Historical Data

Measure	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	19.62%
B	2018	67.60%
C	2018	84.37%

Measure	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	27.50%	28.25%	29.00%	29.75%	17.62%
A	Data	20.74%	20.24%	19.62%	19.39%	17.88%
B	Target >=	75.67%	78.67%	81.67%	85.07%	65.50%
B	Data	66.82%	68.77%	67.60%	60.56%	65.55%
C	Target >=	90.83%	93.83%	96.83%	99.83%	82.37%
C	Data	82.63%	84.32%	84.37%	83.37%	82.82%

14 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	17.62%	18.29%	18.97%	20.31%	23.00%
Target B >=	65.50%	65.81%	66.13%	66.75%	68.00%
Target C >=	82.37%	82.70%	83.03%	83.69%	85.00%

14 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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 2021 SPP/APR Data

Measurement	Data
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	5,011
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,508
Response Rate	50.05%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	494
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,169
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)	236
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).	176

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	494	2,508	17.88%	17.62%	19.70%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,663	2,508	65.55%	65.50%	66.31%	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)	2,075	2,508	82.82%	82.37%	82.74%	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	2020	2021
Response Rate	50.46%	50.05%

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

USBE postsecondary transition specialists have provided multiple learning opportunities and direct training to special education directors and teacher specialists in improving survey response rates. USBE recognizes and awards LEAs for high response rates on their post school outcomes survey annually. In addition to recognition, training, and support, stipends for educators to conduct surveys are also available to LEAs.

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 2.3% underrepresentation of Hispanic and Latino students reflected in the survey responses. There was, however, a nonresponse bias with the dropout responses, which reflected a 4% underrepresentation in the survey. Steps to reduce underrepresentation and bias are outlined in the "If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics" section.

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. 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.

The USBE SES has used data matching with Adult Education to close the gap of responses from students who dropped out which has closed the gap in representative responses over the last several years. The USBE SES is continually working to examine the root causes to implement strategies that will decrease disproportionality in the survey data. Additionally, the USBE SES 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 2021), the USBE SES matched student exit data with Adult Education enrollment data to increase outcomes 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. 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 SES had a 4% underrepresentation of students who dropped out of school in the FFY 2021 survey data, an increase of 1% over the FFY 2020 survey data. This is likely due to the increase in dropouts overall and the fact that there are now more students to survey. There were 1007 dropouts in 2021 and 865 in 2020.

Demographic data were collected for race and ethnicity, but no group showed underrepresentation larger than 1.8%. Gap representation has decreased since 2018 when there was a 7% underrepresentation in the survey of students who dropped out due to matching data with Adult Education.

The USBE SES is continually working to examine the root causes to implement strategies that will decrease disproportionality in the survey data. Additionally, the USBE SES 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 2021), the USBE matched student exit data with Adult Education enrollment data to increase outcomes data for those students who had dropped out and have enrolled in Adult Education for completion of a GED or Adult Education Diploma. 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](https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/deanna_taylor_schools_utah_gov/EewbktRHIARGmsG4ouxYREIBeQbj_hvUneQ8cvZgT0k3UQ?e=7xa0av) (https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/deanna_taylor_schools_utah_gov/EewbktRHIARGmsG4ouxYREIBeQbj_hvUneQ8cvZgT0k3UQ?e=7xa0av).

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)

14 – Prior FFY 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.

14 – Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The USBE SES has responded to this requirement in the following sections:

- 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 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.
- Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

If additional or more specific information is needed, please request it during the clarification period.

14 – OSEP Response

The State did not describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 – Required Actions

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 ED Facts 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

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 SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and

individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A	N/A
Data	0.00%	66.67%	44.44%	80.00%	37.50%

15 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

15 – FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	3	37.50%	N/A	33.33%	N/A	N/A

15 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE held fewer than 10 resolution sessions in FFY 2021. One of the three resolution sessions was successfully resolved through settlement agreements. Due to Utah's consistently low number of resolution sessions, targets are not required.

During the 2021 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 reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. 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 ED Facts 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	11
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	3

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 SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES

calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing

the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	60.00%	60.25%
Data	100.00%	90.00%	68.75%	62.50%	84.62%

16 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.50%	60.75%	61.00%	61.25%	61.50%

16 – FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2	3	11	84.62%	60.50%	45.45%	Did not meet target	Slippage

16 – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The USBE continues to experience very low mediation rates. During FFY 2021, the USBE added a box to its State complaint and due process complaint forms where parents or adult students could elect to request mediation without a separate request. Despite this, the USBE experienced a reduction in the number of overall mediation requests (a total of 18) and mediation sessions (a total of 11) from FFY 2020. When there are so few mediations, one or two unsuccessful mediations can completely prevent the USBE from meeting its target. That is what occurred here.

16 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the 2021 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 2025–2026 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.

Utah has a very low mediation rate, averaging fewer than 10 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

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 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 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 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023, for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023, for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) 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 will reduce the percentage of students ages 19–22 (super seniors) 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).

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

YES

17 – Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR

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 seniors) 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.

17 – Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR

In addition to six years of implementation of our middle school mathematics achievement improvement SiMR, which did have a positive impact on outcomes, the CCPD reviewed five years of Indicator 14 data to support the change of the 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 316 out of 701 super senior students.

17 – Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR

The Utah Statewide Collaborative on Improving Postsecondary Transition Outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities (STC) is a working partnership of state agencies and 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 articulated 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 that is the SiMR. The STC has also developed a theory of action and then implementation activities in order 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.

17 – Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR

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 STC. 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 STC represents all stakeholders of students with disabilities in the state, and once a SiMR and annual targets were proposed, they were reviewed with each set of stakeholders for feedback (UPC, USEAM, PTA, state agencies, and nonprofit organizations) who were ALL excited about the updated focus on postsecondary transition for Utah's SSIP and agree with the SiMR as proposed by the STC.

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

YES

17 – Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset consists of respondents to the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes (PSO) survey who were enrolled as “super seniors” at the time they exited school. Super seniors are defined as students who did not exit with their four-year graduation cohort (i.e., the students with whom they entered in 9th grade and with whom they were expected to graduate/exit in four years). Instead, they took 1–3 years longer to exit. Generally, these students were between the ages of 19 and 22 at the time that they exited school.

The denominator for Indicator 17 includes all super seniors who responded to the PSO survey. The numerator is the count of super seniors who reported being unengaged or under-engaged on the PSO survey.

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

YES

17 – Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action

A new theory of action was developed to identify broad improvement strategies needed to achieve the new SiMR.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of Indicator 14 Survey Respondents ages 19–22 “super seniors” Reporting Under-engaged or Disengaged

Total Number of Indicator 14 Survey Respondents ages 19–22 “super seniors”

17 – Please provide a link to the current theory of action

<https://www.schools.utah.gov/file/9df61f62-dc01-4eb7-8e12-ca9fe8fe5579>

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
2020	45.65%

17 – Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	45.65%	43.15%	40.65%	35.65%	25.65%

17 – FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of Indicator 14 Survey Use Respondents Ages 19-22, "super seniors," Reporting Under-engaged or Disengaged	Total Number of Indicator 14 Survey Respondents ages 19-22, "super seniors"	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
154	316	8.89%	45.65%	48.73%	Met target	No Slippage

17 – Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data

The data was gathered from the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Survey.

17 – Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR

The data is collected for Indicator 14. A subset of students ages 19-22 is pulled out and this data is analyzed for the SiMR.

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)

NO

17 – Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

17 – Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan

<https://www.schools.utah.gov/file/0a6063ee-6c11-41b1-97f8-2859857a8a5c>

17 – Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

17 – If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan

Utah’s evaluation plan for the SSIP has two major parts. The first is the SiMR target calculation, which is calculated from a subset of the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Survey.

The second part is the evaluation of the components within each of the three broad improvement strategies identified in the Theory of Action including comprehensive supports for youth and families, smooth flow of services, and coordination of services. This first year, evaluating outcomes of the improvement strategies involved gathering baseline data on all target activities and outputs identified in the logic model and reviewing activities and progress with stakeholders (see Section C). Most of Utah’s data is related to outputs, as opposed to outcomes, and the fact that all stakeholders actively contributed to choosing output targets supports Utah’s decision to continue implementing these strategies.

17 – If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan

Utah’s evaluation plan was updated this year (FFY 2021) to reflect the new SiMR reported in the 2022 SSIP submission.

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 common concerns and vision for improvement among the postsecondary transition stakeholders that make up the Statewide Postsecondary Transition Collaborative (STC) to Improve Post School Outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities. Those concerns were transformed into three broad improvement strategies including comprehensive supports for youth and families, smooth flow of services, and coordination of services. The Theory of Action then demonstrated how each broad improvement strategy leveraged the strengths of the USBE and its STC partner initiatives and priorities to build statewide capacity for improvement, while at the same time decreasing the impact of infrastructure gaps. All three broad improvement strategies were implemented during the reporting period. To summarize what is required to implement each strategy, common components or considerations of each strategy were turned into improvement activities. These are listed below.

STRATEGY I – 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

- Improve LEA attendance and participation in the annual Postsecondary Transition Institute for educators. This Institute is designed for teams to return year after year to set and complete annual goals to build capacity within their LEA to engage in quality postsecondary transition planning for SWD as mandated in IDEA

b. Education and opportunities for youth and families (sharing information and improving skills)

- Improve attendance and participation in Transition University for youth with disabilities and their families through the Utah Parent Center

- Improve enrollment in Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) for SWD through vocational rehabilitation
 - Improve utilization of the Transition Elevated planning app among SWD as they participate in the development of their own IEP postsecondary transition plans
- c. Improved access to supports and services for underserved populations
- Improve access to and enrollment in CTE pathways for SWD
 - Improve LEA knowledge and utilization of the Career Development Credential for SWD

STRATEGY II – SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES FOR TRANSITION-AGE YOUTH (DESCRIBE THE IDEAL SET OF TRANSITION SERVICES AND EXPERIENCES — THE “WHAT”)

- a. Improve our data match across agencies from 80% to 100%
- Student-level data sharing agreements in place between the USBE, Department of Workforce Services (DWS), and Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
 - Establish a baseline for student-level data match across agencies
- b. Tracking services and engagement over time by student
- Map services received for a representative sample of 2020 exiters (2021 survey respondents)
- c. Create a Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD based on students in our sample who are engaged in the community after school (Indicator 14C)
- Create a flow of services timeline for students, families, and educators
 - Compile student success examples to share with students, families, and educators

STRATEGY III – 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
- Create a standardized referral form with release of information for use between agencies
 - Create a repository with each agency’s information to which postsecondary transition stakeholders can refer students and families
- c. Improve data sharing system to improve communication and coordination in co-serving youth across agencies
- Create an addendum for agency progress reporting forms to track information sharing between agencies
 - Establish a baseline for the number of LEAs and outside agencies sharing progress data for students being co-served
- d. Create a common language to communicate with families about postsecondary transition without jargon specific to different agencies
- Create a universal document with a common vision of postsecondary transition and a glossary of terms
 - Build a website to house the vision and resources for postsecondary transition in Utah

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.

Utah's SSIP describes the state system of postsecondary transition service providers and its efforts to build capacity to assist LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD and evaluate the impact of Utah's improvement efforts. These improvement efforts align with the IDEA and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The success of the SSIP requires systematic improvement across the USBE, LEAs, and community partner agencies to leverage existing strengths while simultaneously closing system gaps. These stakeholders need to make the following systems changes to impact the SiMR:

1. Align and leverage current postsecondary transition improvement initiatives across stakeholders
2. Increase utilization of evidence-based practices (EBPs)
3. Improve infrastructure and coordination for delivering effective PL and TA
4. Increase meaningful collaboration of state and local stakeholders around SSIP efforts
5. Increase capacity to effectively utilize national TA resources
6. Increase capacity at the local level to implement systems that support effective implementation of postsecondary transition planning

These combined efforts will lead to improved postsecondary transition planning for SWD, which in turn will improve state results in graduation, dropout, and post school outcomes in employment and higher education as SWD will have the skills and preparation they need to achieve post school success. 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 EBPs.

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORTS FOR YOUTH AND FAMILIES

- 1) The Postsecondary Transition Institute (PTI) hosted 207 participants from 32 LEA teams in June 2022. Plans from 22 LEA teams were submitted to the USBE Postsecondary Transition Team (UPTT) for review. The Supports for Youth and Families Workgroup (SYFW; a subcommittee of the STC) analyzed team attendance for the past seven years. During that time, 86 different teams have attended. While the number of teams attending each year has remained relatively stable around 45 teams (except for during the COVID-19 years), only 14 teams attended consistently over at least six of the seven years.
- 2) The SYFW analyzed previous years' feedback from the PTI to look for patterns that might inform why teams are not attending and areas for improvement to better meet the needs of

professionals who are attending. Themes were identified and shared with the PTI planning team for use in planning for 2023.

- 3) Baseline Transition University attendance: 23 youth with disabilities and 265 family members were trained using the Transition University curriculum between August 1, 2021, and July 31, 2022.
- 4) Baseline Pre-ETS enrollment data: 27,406 transition-age youth were served in special education and 9,163 students had 504 plans in place in the 2021 school year, making 36,569 students potentially eligible for Pre-ETS services. However, from August 15, 2021, to August 14, 2022, only 2,913 students accessed Pre-ETS services (~8% of those potentially eligible). This is only an estimate because the number of potentially eligible students was only the number of students with a current IEP or 504 Plan, whereas, the number of students served in Pre-ETS also includes students with a medical diagnosis but no IEP or 504. Those students who qualify for Pre-ETS without an IEP or 504 could not reliably be excluded from the Pre-ETS data due to data collection processes. The percentage of potentially eligible students receiving Pre-ETS services is likely slightly lower than 8%, but this is the best comparison available with current data collection practices.
- 5) Baseline Transition Elevated App utilization: 1,503 students used the app in the 2021 school year.
- 6) Baseline patterns of CTE participation for SWD: The UPTT analyzed four years of CTE enrollment data from the 2018 through 2021 school years. Means were established for CTE pathway completers (3.0 credits completed) and CTE pathway concentrators (1.5 credits completed) for general education students and SWD. On average, SWD were less likely to concentrate in a CTE pathway than general education students by 3.26 percentage points and SWD were less likely to complete a CTE pathway than general education students by 3.10 percentage points. This disparity represents a slight underrepresentation of SWD in CTE pathways in Utah overall. At the LEA level, seven LEAs (5 districts and 2 charter schools) were identified for consistent representation of SWD in CTE pathways over the four years examined, and twelve (6 districts and 6 charter schools) were identified for consistent underrepresentation of SWD in CTE pathways. The remaining LEAs showed mixed results resulting in average levels of representation.
- 7) A survey of educator knowledge regarding the Career Development Credential for SWD showed most educators across disciplines have little to no knowledge of this educational opportunity, contributing to the low number of SWD earning this credential.

SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES

- 1) Review of current data sharing agreements and memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between the USBE and other state agencies determined a new data sharing agreement was needed between USBE, DHHS, and DWS to support improved collaboration between agencies in co-serving SWD. A draft outline for the new agreement was produced by the Flow of Services Workgroup (a subcommittee of the STC). The draft outline includes a purpose statement for the agreement and lists the student-level data elements for each agency proposed to be included in the new agreement.
- 2) Respondents to the 2021 Indicator 14 survey within the SiMR target age range were identified as possible interviewees to examine service patterns over time for those who

reported being engaged in meaningful post school activities and for those who reported being under-engaged or unengaged in meaningful post school activities.

- 3) Resources for existing timelines from other states and national TA centers were reviewed in preparation for developing the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD.

COORDINATION OF SERVICES

- 1) The Coordination of Services Workgroup (CSW; a subcommittee of the STC) drafted a universal referral form for all agencies in the STC to use when referring students to services from other providers. The form was reviewed by all agencies to ensure it contained information universally collected by agencies upon referral. The purpose of creating a system-wide referral form was to simplify the process for SWD, their families, and service providers. This is the first step in coming together as a statewide system of postsecondary transition stakeholders.
- 2) The development of a one-stop postsecondary transition website for Utah has begun. The structure of the website has been designed and content development is beginning. The CSW is acting as the stakeholder group to ensure content represents the statewide system of postsecondary transition rather than one or two individual agencies. As part of this effort, the CSW drafted and is refining the vision statement for postsecondary transition for the State of Utah and the purpose statement for the website.

These strategies support systems change as more stakeholders will understand the tenets of postsecondary transition and barriers to services are addressed through deliberate collaboration. These outcomes will lead to the achievement of the SiMR and support efforts to scale-up and create a sustainable long-term improvement effort. Based on discussions with Utah's stakeholders, the improvement activities currently being implemented are appropriate to impact the SiMR and to improve postsecondary outcomes for SWD as educators, students, and families receive training and support in postsecondary transition planning and services and service providers work together to create a unified system of postsecondary transition in Utah.

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

The STC will continue to work collaboratively to implement the activities as described above. The next steps for each broad improvement strategy are described below.

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORTS FOR YOUTH AND FAMILIES

- 1) Incorporate the previous PTI feedback analysis into future institute planning to improve the content to better meet educators' professional learning needs.

- 2) Expand the advertising of the PTI through new STC channels, targeted social media, and target specific LEAs based on results-driven accountability outcomes related to postsecondary transition indicators.
- 3) Draft and distribute a letter from the STC as a unified collaborative to families endorsing the three educational opportunities for youth and families outlined above.
- 4) Create a statewide, unified definition of postsecondary transition and glossary of terms from relevant stakeholder agencies to improve communication between and understanding of current resources in the state.
- 5) Host focus groups with educators to identify barriers and solutions to CTE access for SWD.
- 6) Create a system to track the number of SWD in the state earning the Career Development Credential.

SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES

- 1) A complete MOU drafted between the USBE, DWS, and DHHS.
- 2) Analyze Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Survey qualitative data for the question, “What positive experiences did you have during high school that helped you achieve your postsecondary goals?” for the last five survey years. Look for themes and patterns to inform the development of the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD.
- 3) Contract with the Utah Education Policy Center to complete student interviews from our FFY 2021 survey respondent sample to inform the development of the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD.

COORDINATION OF SERVICES

- 1) Finalize the repository for agency information to make referrals to services more accurate and efficient.
- 2) Implement the universal referral form with participating agencies.
- 3) Create a universal addendum to agency reporting for progress data sharing between agencies as they co-serve SWD.
- 4) Complete Utah’s postsecondary transition website development.

The anticipated outcomes in the next reporting period for these strategies are (a) increasing the number of educators and the variety of professionals participating in the PTI in LEA teams; (b) increase the number of youth with disabilities and their families participating in Transition University, Pre-ETS, and utilizing the Transition Elevated planning app; (c) improve the quality of data sharing agreements between agencies that serve postsecondary transition-age youth; and (d) continue to collaboratively (across agencies and organizations) develop defined expectations for postsecondary transition experiences for SWD in Utah. By achieving these outcomes, Utah will continue to build a statewide system of supports for postsecondary transition and decrease the amount of work being done in silos. This collaborative system will help SWD who remain in special education services after their senior year (ages 19–22) access and utilize services more effectively which will lead to improved levels of engagement after these students exit school.

17 – List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period

Utah’s SSIP has selected the following EBPs using the Predictors of Post-school success research as they relate to our infrastructure improvement strategies:

- Interagency collaboration
- CTE pathway concentration or completion
- Parent training to teach knowledge of transition services
- Self-determination/Self-advocacy
- Student support

17 – Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

Interagency collaboration is a clear, purposeful, and carefully designed process in which education professionals establish partnerships with personnel from multiple agencies (e.g., VR, DSPD, Providers, CTE) with the common goal of achieving positive and measurable postsecondary outcomes of SWD. Interagency collaboration is a means to (a) coordinate services and supports at the student level, (b) identify and address gaps in services within the local community, (c) share and leverage resources to reduce costs, and (d) promote efficient service delivery for all SWD. Interagency teams should lead with the philosophy, disposition, and mindset that all individuals with disabilities can work. (Citation: USBE Interagency Collaboration Tool <https://padlet.com/transitionteams/collaborationteams>)

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

CTE is a sequence of courses that prepares students for a specific job or career at various levels from trade or craft positions to technical, business, or professional careers (Citation: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf). Career Pathways show students a direct connection between doing well in high school and being able to transition smoothly to postsecondary opportunities when they graduate. Students who focus on a Career Pathway acquire the skills necessary for entry into well-paid careers with high potential for rapid financial growth, increased levels of responsibility, and a high degree of personal satisfaction. (Citation: <https://www.schools.utah.gov/cte/about>)

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Parents/families/guardians of youth with disabilities are active and knowledgeable participants in all aspects of transition planning (e.g., decision-making, providing support, attending meetings, and advocating for their child) through learning/training opportunities, experiences, and support in postsecondary transition services. To maximize the power of parent involvement in the postsecondary transition process, it is critical for parents to have opportunities to increase their knowledge in this area. Youth with disabilities whose parents expect them to secure employment, attend college, and/or be able to support themselves are more likely to be found employed and accessing further education as young adults. (Citations: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf, http://project10.info/Documents/FINAL_Post_School_Predictor_Product_6.13.19C.pdf, <https://utahparentcenter.org/>)

SELF-DETERMINATION / SELF-ADVOCACY

Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy encompasses skills critical to a meaningful adult life. Instruction and experiences in self-determination (the ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, and accept consequences of one's actions) and self-advocacy (the ability to speak up for oneself and communicate what is important) leads to positive post school outcomes for

youth with disabilities. (Citation: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf)

STUDENT SUPPORT

Student support is the network of people (e.g., family, friends, educators, and adult service providers) who provide services and resources in multiple settings and environments to prepare students to transition from student life to adult life. This network of people who provide student support should keep in mind the student's postsecondary goals and be aware of the student's strengths, preferences, interests, and needs. The collaboration strengthens the impact of support to the student by broadening the circle of people to include those with firsthand experience in providing adult based services. Making linkages with the service system that will take over responsibility for ongoing support creates conditions for the youth to move successfully into adult living and working. Student support includes both formal and informal networks. Youth success is enhanced by a network regardless of whether it is formal or informal. These networks promote individualized planning and services to prepare students for adult life. (Citations: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf, http://project10.info/Documents/FINAL_Post_School_Predictor_Product_6.13.19C.pdf)

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

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

The development of the STC is a targeted effort to improve interagency collaboration for postsecondary transition in Utah. The activities of the STC (i.e., student level data sharing agreements between agencies, a systematic referral process, development of a common language regarding postsecondary transition, and the creation of the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD) are designed to bring stakeholders together in a unified system of supports for SWD. This improved collaborative system will support more robust service delivery to SWD as they prepare to transition into young adulthood after exiting the education system. Effective interagency collaboration has been shown to be a positive predictor of post school outcomes in the areas of education and employment (Mazzotti, 2020).

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

Concentration in and completion of CTE pathways have been shown to lead to better post school outcomes for SWD in both education and employment (Lee et. al., 2014; Mazzotti et. Al., 2020). By improving access to CTE pathways for our SWD, we are offering opportunities, instruction, and supports that will lead to better engagement in meaningful activity after high school. One avenue in which SWD can benefit from CTE pathway participation is earning the Career Development Credential (CDC). The CDC is a career-focused work experience that is intended to be earned while a student is working toward a regular high school diploma or the alternate diploma. The purpose of the CDC is to provide SWD internships and/or paid work experiences aligned with a CTE concentration. Paid work experiences while in high school are

another evidence-based predictor of post school success and, as such, support the achievement of the SiMR.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Utah's Parent Training and Information Center, the Utah Parent Center, has developed a parent and youth workshop series called Transition University. Transition University was developed in 2020 in partnership with various postsecondary transition stakeholders in the state. The training is comprised of six topics titled 1) Citizenship & Advocacy, 2) Education, Employment, & Daily Life Skills, 3) Self-Determination & Person-Centered Planning, 4) Safety & Security, 5) Social and Spirituality, and 6) Healthy Living. The training is available throughout the state through live virtual sessions and includes a workbook developed for youth ages 14 and older and a comprehensive transition guidebook for families. This parent-to-parent model of support educates both youth with disabilities and their families in the power of holding high expectations that are realistic and supports effective postsecondary transition planning for SWD.

Comprehensive student-driven and family-supported postsecondary transition planning has been shown to improve post school outcomes for SWD. For this reason, the EBP of parent training to teach knowledge of transition services as embodied in Transition University was chosen as one of Utah's activities to support the achievement of the SiMR.

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

To increase student self-determination, self-advocacy, student-driven IEP planning, and family involvement in postsecondary transition planning, the USBE SES developed the Transition Elevated App in 2020 for youth and families to enhance preparation for the postsecondary transition planning IEP process. The App allows students and families to have input in the postsecondary transition IEP process and includes links to outside agencies, tips for a successful postsecondary transition IEP meeting, and considers the student's strengths, preferences, interests, and needs. When the student has completed the questions in the App, a draft postsecondary transition plan is generated for the student and family to share at the postsecondary transition IEP meeting. Increasing the utilization of this App will encourage student self-advocacy in postsecondary transition IEP development. When students are involved in their postsecondary transition planning, they are more motivated to engage in the opportunities, instruction, services, and supports outlined in the postsecondary transition plan which leads to better post school outcomes.

The Utah Parent Center through the Transition University workshops has emphasized student voice and choice through its workbook activities that include instruction and tools for person-centered planning, self-advocacy, disability awareness, soft skills, independent living skills, IEP participation, disability laws, and supported decision making. These workshops improve student knowledge and skills in the postsecondary transition process which, in turn, leads to better post school outcomes.

STUDENT SUPPORT

SWD are supported in developing, refining, and/or working towards achieving their postsecondary goals after high school that are individualized based on their strengths, interests, preferences, and needs. These services are initiated and supported by the adults identified by the IEP team. The services occur through instruction, coaching, and/or providing opportunities

for practice and experiences. Examples of targeted support services intended to impact a change or increase in teacher/provider practices that will improve student outcomes include:

- School counselors support SWD for the purpose of planning for the students' futures and ensuring their engagement in school activities which address course planning, graduation, and postsecondary education and employment (i.e., college week, scholarship opportunities, ACT, concurrent enrollment, etc.).
- Pre-ETS services: LEAs collaborate with Pre-ETS providers to offer SWD the opportunities and experiences to explore and plan for successful future employment through targeted training in job exploration, work-based learning experiences, counseling on postsecondary employment and education, workplace readiness, and instruction in self-advocacy.
- Targeted postsecondary transition services provided in the areas of self-determination/self-advocacy, community-based instruction, work-based learning, the use of assistive technology.

17 – Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change

This is the first year of implementation and we have collected data to establish our baselines for all specified improvement strategies. This year did not include assessment of practice change for this reason.

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

No additional data was collected this year.

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

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

Utah will continue to scale up the work of the STC by completing a draft of the MOUs between state agencies that will improve our ability to work together to serve SWD. This process will define what referrals and progress report data sharing will look like among agency partners. Utah will implement the universal referral form created during this reporting period among all stakeholder agencies. Utah will develop a one-stop Postsecondary Transition Website for use among all stakeholder groups (i.e., youth, parents, families, educators, and community service providers) that centralizes resource access and establishes a common language for postsecondary transition that all stakeholders can understand.

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

Utah will conduct focus groups with educators in LEAs who have equal or better representation of SWD in CTE pathways and educators in LEAs who have very low representation of SWD in CTE pathways to identify patterns that might lead to improved utilization of this EBP for SWD in our

state. Utah will also explore and implement ways to improve educator knowledge of the CDC for SWD.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Utah will develop and implement new marketing materials for families sponsored by the full group of STC stakeholders. The materials will explain and support the highlighted educational opportunities (i.e., Transition University, the Transition Elevated Planning App, and Pre-ETS services). Information will be disseminated using the STC network to increase the number and diversity of families who have access to these opportunities. Information will also be shared with educators through monthly newsletters so they can share with students and families as appropriate.

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

Through the outreach described previously, students, families, and educators will receive information on resources to support SWD in becoming self-advocates. Utah anticipates an increase in utilization of the Transition Elevated Planning App and Transition University. This will lead to an increase in SWD actively participating in postsecondary transition planning for their own IEPs.

STUDENT SUPPORT

Utah will interview students who have recently exited from the school system to identify patterns of services that led to those students being meaningfully engaged in education and employment activities after leaving school. Utah will use the results of these interviews to begin development of a Portrait of Postsecondary Transition emphasizing best practices and a timeline of services for successful outcomes in Utah.

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

YES

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

Utah experienced an increase in the dropout rate for students with disabilities (SWD) in FFY2021 and a decrease in the FFY2021 graduation rate due to the impacts of COVID-19. Many students were deficient in credits and therefore were not able to graduate with their cohort, thus impacting their post school outcomes. Based on our 2022 post school outcomes survey data, many former students identified the following barriers to achieving their post school goals: mental health issues, physical/disability-related health issues, lack of employment support, COVID-19-related issues (i.e., COVID-19 related mental health issues, less access to the community, slower and more complicated processes), and lack of support from adult services (lack of providers, turnover in Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) offices, dissatisfaction with VR services/poor experience, long wait times, long Division of Services for People with Disabilities (DSPD) waitlist time). As COVID-19 is the primary factor in lack of post school outcomes achievement, the current SSIP implementation plan is still appropriate and should lead to meaning results in future reporting periods.

Due to this year's broad improvement strategy implementation data being baseline data, we currently do not have strategy evaluation data with which to consider modifications to the SSIP. The next reporting period will focus on collecting strategy evaluation data to assess the results of our efforts to improve this indicator.

17 – Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

17 – Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE SES 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. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE SES employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups:

- 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 SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2021, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

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 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 asked to select the end targets (2025–2026) for indicators. The USBE SES would then calculate intervening targets between FFY 2020 and FFY 2025 whereby there would be no increase in the target the first year, followed by small increases, then large increases near the end. This is to allow enough time for LEAs to implement initiatives and change practices to realistically meet targets along their way to the rigorous end targets. After this overview, participants determined challenging and achievable end targets. The USBE SES calculated intervening targets and shared these intervening targets with the participants and 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/Native Alaskan, Hispanic/Latino, and individuals who identified as multiracial also participated. As a result of this additional feedback, the USBE SES revised Indicator 5 targets to maintain rigor and develop reasonable targets manageable by the LEAs. Targets for all indicators were developed after review of historical indicator and trend data, recommendations from the USBE statistician, the impact of COVID-19, APR summit and APR survey review. All targets were subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE staff, USEAP, and LEAs. OSEP approved SPP/APR targets in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

During FFY 2021, the SPP/APR and SSIP were discussed regularly with LEA special education directors, USEAP, UPC, the state Parent Teacher Association (PTA), and other parent groups focused on inclusionary practices in Utah schools. Regular meetings are held with all these groups typically on a quarterly basis. Emails, phone calls, and in-person meetings provide for informal opportunities to gain insight and adjust.

The UPC works closely with USBE to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Meetings at UPC are held in Spanish as the second highest language in the State. Refugee populations are connected through UPC staff assigned to specific LEAs with large populations of refugees.

The USBE family engagement specialist seeks to increase capacity through cross collaboration with other parent and family engagement programs provided in LEAs that we will continue to target.

INDICATOR 1

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

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

This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders discussed ways to improve participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, D

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.

INDICATOR 5

During FFY 2020, the Indicator 5 baseline was reset. In FFY 2021, all targets were met. A comprehensive approach was taken to provide informative learning sessions to support special education directors who are accountable for reviewing Indicator 5 outcome data. Recognizing the need to differentiate support, the USBE SES offered individual LEA data analysis and problem-solving sessions.

INDICATOR 6

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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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%, (C2) 70.52%, targets will increase with consideration for COVID-19 impacts.

INDICATOR 8

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

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 targets for these indicators. The calculations and data collection process for these indicators has been updated to improve outcomes for SWD. Stakeholder input has been utilized to determine processes, PL, and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATORS 11, 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 targets for these indicators. Input has been utilized to determine PL and support provided to bridge the gap between current performance and targets.

INDICATOR 13

The USBE SES 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

Data from 2018 was determined to be an appropriate baseline. 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 (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

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. As described in the previous submission, the Coordinating Council of People with Disabilities (CCPD) spent more than a year collaboratively determining that improving postsecondary outcomes for youth with disabilities is a vital need in Utah. This led to Utah's change of SiMR focus and creation of the STC to address the CCPD priorities. As a result, an unprecedented number of state agency staff and staff in nonprofit and postsecondary transition-oriented service organizations around the state have collaborated in the work of implementing Utah's Theory of Action and Logic Model through participation in the STC. The collaborating agencies participating in the STC are:

- USBE: Special Education, Adult Education, Youth in Care and Neglected and Delinquent Youth, Career and Technical Education
- Utah Parent Center
- Utah Statewide Independent Living Council
- Utah Registry of Autism and Developmental Disabilities
- Utah Parent Teacher Association
- Department of Workforce Services: Office of Rehabilitative Services, Career and Education Program (WIOA Youth Program)
- Department of Health and Human Services: High-fidelity Wraparound System of Care, Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice and Youth Services, Stabilization and Mobile Response, Office of Substance Abuse and Mental Health, Division of Services for People with Disabilities, Children with Special Health Care Needs, Division of Family Health, Medicaid
- Intermountain Health Care
- Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind
- Utah System of Higher Education
- Governor's Committee on Employment for People with Disabilities
- Utah State University Institute for Disability Research, Policy, and Practice

This year, the STC was broken down into three subcommittees – each addressing one of the broad improvement strategies outlined in the Logic Model. These subcommittees have broad representation from the agencies listed above and meet monthly to work through the action plan for each output related to their assigned section. The full STC meets quarterly to review the action plans of the subcommittees and approve proposed actions. Utah's stakeholders were engaged in every stage of the SSIP implementation through participation in the STC.

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

NO

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

The State does not intend to engage in any activities not already described above in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

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

The State does not intend to engage in any activities not already described above in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

17 – Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers

The State has not identified any new barriers.

17 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2020 data prepopulated in the "FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data" section was related to the previous SSIP and SiMR regarding middle school mathematics proficiency. Utah changed its SSIP and SiMR during FFY 2020 requiring a new baseline. OSEP accepted Utah's change in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. The FFY 2021 target, data, and future targets are related to the new SSIP and SiMR regarding post school outcomes for students ages 19–22. The current SiMR is 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 (from 45.65% in FFY 2020 to 25.65% by FFY 2025). The FFY 2021 target is 45.65%. The FFY 2021 data is 48.73%. As the goal is to be below the target, Utah did not meet target.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State reported its 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). In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State reports its

SiMR as, "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); However, the State did not report that the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission. The State must clarify.

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that baseline revision because the State's FFY 2020 baseline data reported in the Historical Data table is not consistent with the State's FFY 2020 data reported in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data table. Additionally, OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2021-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given the discrepancy in the baseline data, as noted above. The State must ensure that its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over the baseline.

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:

Asst. Supt. of Student Support (State Director of Special Education)

Email:

leah.voorhies@schools.utah.gov

Phone:

801-538-7898

Submitted on:

04/26/23 1:38:13 PM