

UPIPS

Utah Program Improvement Planning System

2018–2019 MANUAL



UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION 250 EAST 500 SOUTH P.O. BOX 144200 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84114-4200

SYDNEE DICKSON, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ADA Compliant: 12/20/2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Utah State Board of Education Strategic Plan—Education Elevated	1
Purpose: Educational Excellence	1
Imperatives	1
I. Educational Equity	1
II. Quality Learning.....	1
III. System Values	1
Overview of Utah’s Monitoring System.....	2
UPIPS Objectives	2
UPIPS Themes	3
Six Principles of IDEA.....	3
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)	3
Appropriate Evaluation	3
Individualized Education Program	4
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)	4
Parent and Student Participation in Decision Making	4
Procedural Safeguards	4
Utah’s Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS)	4
UPIPS Program Areas and Goal Statements	5
Program Area I—General Supervision	5
Program Area II—Parent Involvement	5
Program Area III—FAPE in the LRE	5
Program Area IV—Transition.....	5
Program Area V—Disproportionality.....	6
UPIPS Program Review Areas	7
Utah SPP/APR/SSIP	8
Relevant Documents.....	8
APR Indicators in the SPP.....	8
Framework for Recognition, Assistance, and Intervention (APR Determination)	10
Determination Level Criteria.....	10
Rewards and Enforcement Actions.....	11
USB ESES Tiered Monitoring Structure	12
UPIPS Program Improvement Supports and Activities.....	12

Tiered Monitoring One-Year Process	16
RDA Tier Descriptions	17
Supporting Tier	17
Description	17
Supports Available	17
Activities.....	17
Guiding Tier.....	17
Description	17
Supports Available	18
Activities.....	18
Assisting Tier	18
Description	18
Supports Available	18
Activities.....	18
Coaching Tier	19
Description	19
Supports Available	19
Activities.....	19
Directing Tier.....	20
Description	20
Supports Available	20
Activities.....	20
Data Collection and Analysis.....	21
Stakeholder Steering Committee	21
Purpose	21
Committee Membership Requirements.....	21
Committee Membership Options	21
Interview Data	21
Student Record Review Data	22
Outcome Data.....	22
Other Data Sources.....	23
Other Data at LEA Discretion	23
Internal Student Record Review Guidelines.....	24
Identification and Correction of IDEA Noncompliance.....	25

Identification of Noncompliance	25
Correction of Noncompliance.....	25
Prong 1: Correcting Each Individual Case of Noncompliance.....	25
Prong 2: Correctly Implementing the Specific Regulatory Requirements (i.e., Subsequently Achieved 100% Compliance), Based on the SEA Review of the Updated Data.....	26
Appendix	27
Policies, Procedures, and Practices Review	27
A. Forms	27
B. Child Find System.....	28
C. Identification and Evaluation	31
D. Personnel	32
E. Private Schools (NA for Charter Schools).....	33
F. Fiscal Compliance and Accountability Monitoring (FiCAM) Checklists.....	33
Classroom Observation of Special Education Services	34
Parent Focus Group Questions	35
Yes/No/NA Questions	35
Open Ended Questions	35

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLAN—EDUCATION ELEVATED

Purpose: Educational Excellence

The foundation of the Utah public education system is to provide an opportunity for educational excellence for each Utah student. This requires advocacy, focus, and prioritization of effort.

Imperatives

I. Educational Equity

The Utah State Board of Education will set the general statewide conditions in which each student can excel, including equity of educational opportunities and culturally responsive practices to promote each student’s academic success and well-being. Resources and Board policies and practices will be aligned to high expectations and successful outcomes for each student.

II. Quality Learning

The Utah State Board of Education will place focus on intended learning outcomes as a key to high student achievement with the understanding that high quality instruction is central to that ideal.

III. System Values

The Utah State Board of Education will set the conditions and systems for student success by working with, understanding, and listening to stakeholders on every level on practices, strategies, resources, and policies that will lead to continued and even greater efficiencies and improvements in student outcomes.

(To see more specifics about the Utah State Board of Education Strategic Plan, visit the [Strategic Plan site](https://www.schools.utah.gov/board/utah/strategicplan) [https://www.schools.utah.gov/board/utah/strategicplan]).

OVERVIEW OF UTAH'S MONITORING SYSTEM

The Utah State Board of Education Special Education Services (USBE SES) staff has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. §1400; USBE SER VIII.C and D.). The primary focus is improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities (USBE SER VIII.C.3.)

The USBE SES's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) process, as part of Utah's Program Improvement Plan System (UPIPS) continuous monitoring program, reflects the federal intent to emphasize a data-driven, systematic approach to compliance, as well as the improvement of outcomes for students with disabilities.

UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process. While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is placed on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis on episodic procedural monitoring to active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results.

The RDA process continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of State Education Agency (SEA) support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the SEA according to the LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. Methods and procedures used to implement UPIPS are consistent but flexible, in order to adapt to the individual needs of students, educational settings, and administrative realities.

UPIPS is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process and includes an annual USBE review of each LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier, which includes supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified risk.

UPIPS Objectives

The monitoring system has five major objectives:

1. Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities by linking LEA data to improvement efforts.
2. Ensure compliance with IDEA federal regulations and USBE SER.
3. Connect LEA improvement efforts with IDEA and USBE requirements.
4. Support each LEA in the UPIPS process which includes self-assessment, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and program effectiveness.
5. Link program improvement activities with multi-year professional development.

UPIPS Themes

UPIPS is based on the following underlying principles:

- **Continuity.** UPIPS 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 students with disabilities (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 the LEAs Program Improvement Plan (PIP).
- **Self-Assessment.** Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a self-assessment process that focuses on improving outcomes for students with disabilities.
- **Data-Driven Process.** The improvement process in each LEA is driven by data that focuses on improved outcomes for students with disabilities. On an ongoing basis, each LEA collects and uses data aligned with both the USBE's and the LEA's performance goals and indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the self-assessment process may include, but are not limited to, Utah State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), APR indicators and additional data points on the RDA letter, personnel needs, and other LEA improvement efforts and initiatives.
- **Technical Assistance.** Since the UPIPS process is continuous, technical assistance is a critical component. USBE provides key components of technical assistance such as promising practices and professional development. LEAs are encouraged to include these components as part of their PIP.

Six Principles of IDEA

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

“Free appropriate public education or FAPE means special education and related services that— (A) Are provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge; (B) Meet the standards of the USBE and Part B of the IDEA); (C) Include an appropriate preschool, elementary school, or secondary school education in Utah; and (D) Are provided in conformity with an individualized education program (IEP) that meets the requirements of Part B of the IDEA and these rules (USBE SER I.E.17.)

Appropriate Evaluation

Evaluation teams should collect and examine multiple sources of data, including existing academic achievement and performance data. Additional assessments are administered only as needed to identify the disability and guide the educational program to meet individual needs. Evaluation activities include gathering information related to enabling the child to be involved

in and progress in the general curriculum or, for preschool children, to participate in appropriate activities (USBE SER II.F.).

Individualized Education Program

“Individualized education program (IEP) means a written statement for each child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in accordance with these rules and Part B of the IDEA.” (USBE SER I.E.23).

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

This is the presumption that children with disabilities are most appropriately educated with their non-disabled peers, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular education environment occurs only when “the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily” (USBE SER I.E.25).

Parent and Student Participation in Decision Making

“The Congress finds that: . . . strengthening the role and responsibility of parents and ensuring that families of such children have meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children at school and at home” (20 U.S.C. §1400.(c)(5)(B)).

Procedural Safeguards

Safeguards ensure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents are protected, that students with disabilities and their parents are provided with the information they need to make decisions about the provision of FAPE, and that procedures and mechanisms are in place to resolve disagreements between parties (USBE SER IV).

Utah’s Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS)

UPIPS is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE review of each LEA’s performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and APR indicators. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and APR indicators based on their data in each area. This is provided annually to the LEA in an RDA letter. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier, which includes supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA’s level of identified risk.

UPIPS PROGRAM AREAS AND GOAL STATEMENTS

Program Area I—General Supervision

- Goal Statement 1: FAPE is available to all children enrolled in the LEA, because the SEA and LEA monitoring system and other mechanisms for ensuring compliance and parent and child protections are systematic and utilize data to develop corrective action plans and activities (RDA data points).
- Goal Statement 2: All members of the IEP team have access to professional development and support activities that facilitate improved educational results for students with disabilities and the implementation of the IDEA.
- Goal Statement 3: Evaluation and eligibility procedures that focus on needs of students with disabilities and are determined based upon State definitions, eligibility criteria, and appropriate evaluation procedures (APR Indicator 11).
- Goal Statement 4: Students with disabilities are making continuous progress within the SEA and LEA systems for educational accountability under the Utah Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS) (APR Indicators 1–3).

Program Area II—Parent Involvement

- Goal Statement 5: Parents and eligible students with disabilities are aware of and have access to their rights and responsibilities within the system for parent and child protections.
- Goal Statement 6: Program and services for students with disabilities improve because parents are actively involved in program improvement activities (APR Indicator 8).

Program Area III—FAPE in the LRE

- Goal Statement 7: All students with disabilities receive FAPE in the LRE that promotes a high quality education and prepares them for post-school employment and independent living (APR Indicators 1–2, 4–6).

Program Area IV—Transition

- Goal Statement 8: Children exiting Part C of IDEA (Birth–age 2), who are eligible for Part B of IDEA (ages 3–21), have IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthdays (APR Indicator 12).
- Goal Statement 9: All students with disabilities, beginning at age 14, or earlier if appropriate, receive individualized, coordinated transition services,

designed within an outcome-oriented process that promotes movement from school to post-school activities (APR Indicators 13–14).

Program Area V—Disproportionality

Goal Statement 10: Students are identified as eligible under IDEA following SEA and LEA policies and procedures that ensure those from ethnic and racial minority backgrounds are not inappropriately identified (APR Indicators 9–10).

UIPS Program Review Areas

General Supervision APR Indicators 3, 11, 15	FAPE in the LRE APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Find • Forms • Surrogate Parents • Evaluation/Eligibility/IEE procedures • Timelines (Evaluation and Reevaluation) • English Proficiency Assessments • Qualified Staff • Confidentiality • Statewide Assessment • Policies and Procedures • Fiscal Management • Evaluation Materials • Complaint and Due Process • Referral Process • Professional Development • National Instructional Materials Access Center/National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard NIMAC/NIMAS • State and Federal Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualized Education Programs (IEP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performances (PLAAFPs) and Goals ○ Service Delivery, including Related Services ○ Special Factors ○ Statewide Assessment ○ Extended School Year (ESY) ○ Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) and Health Care Plan ○ Accommodations • Timelines (IEP and Placement) • Physical Education • Access to the General Curriculum • Team Membership • Least Restrictive Environment/Placement • Request for IEP meetings • Discipline • Graduation/Dropout Rates

Parental Involvement APR Indicator 8	Transitions APR Indicators 7, 12, 13, 14	Disproportionality APR Indicators 9, 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies to Parents • Written Prior Notice • Notice of Meeting • Progress Reports • Procedural Safeguard Notice • Parental Consent • Communication in a Variety of Languages • Disciplinary Procedures (LRBI) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part C to Part B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transition Planning with EI ○ Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) ○ IEP in Place by 3rd Birthday • School to Post-School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transition Plans, 14+ ○ Post-secondary Goals ○ Age-Appropriate Transition Assessments ○ Course of Study ○ Summary of Performance ○ Age of Majority ○ Notice to Adult Students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevalence and Categories of Disabilities, Race and Ethnicity

UTAH SPP/APR/SSIP

Relevant Documents

[Utah State Performance Plan \(SPP\), Annual Performance Report \(APR\), and State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\)](https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/datareporting?mid=936&tid=1)

<https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/datareporting?mid=936&tid=1>

[Utah's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators](https://schools.utah.gov/curr/resources/educatorexcellence)

<https://schools.utah.gov/curr/resources/educatorexcellence>

[Utah State Board of Education Strategic Plan](https://schools.utah.gov/board/utah/strategicplan)

<https://schools.utah.gov/board/utah/strategicplan>

Reports on LEA performance on each indicator are distributed annually to each LEA.

APR Indicators in the SPP

- Indicator 1** Improving graduation rates for students with disabilities.
- Indicator 2** Decreasing dropout rates for students with disabilities.
- Indicator 3** Ensuring all students with disabilities participate and are proficient in statewide or alternate assessments.
- Indicator 4** Reducing suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities.
- Indicator 5** Providing services for students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.
- Indicator 6** Providing preschool children with disabilities services in the least restrictive environment.
- Indicator 7** Improving cognitive and social outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.
- Indicator 8** Improving parent involvement in their child's special education program (parent survey).
- Indicator 9** Reducing disproportionality of cultural groups in special education.
- Indicator 10** Reducing the number of students from other cultures in certain disability categories.
- Indicator 11** Improving efforts to locate, evaluate, and serve students with disabilities (Child Find) (initial evaluations completed within 45 school days).
- Indicator 12** Ensuring a smoother transition from preschool programs to school-based programs (IEP developed and implemented by eligible students' third birthday).
- Indicator 13** Improving transition services for students with disabilities at the secondary level, i.e., 14+ years (complete transition plans).

- Indicator 14** Improving the outcomes for students moving from secondary to postsecondary activities (post-school outcomes survey).
- Indicator 15** Increasing the use of resolution sessions to resolve due process hearings.
- Indicator 16** Increasing the use of mediation to resolve differences with the school.
- Indicator 17** State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Framework for Recognition, Assistance, and Intervention (APR Determination)

Further information can be found at the [Office for Special Education Program's SPP/APR Resources](https://osep.grads360.org/#program/spp-apr-resources) website (<https://osep.grads360.org/#program/spp-apr-resources>).

Determination Level Criteria

Meets Requirements	Needs Assistance (NA)	Needs Intervention (NI)	Needs Substantial Intervention (NSI)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEA demonstrates substantial compliance on each compliance indicator (Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13;) and 2. LEA submits valid and reliable data for all indicators, including performance indicators (Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14;) and 3. LEA demonstrates correction of noncompliance identified through other means (e.g., UPIPS, complaints) within 10 months of written notification. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEA does not demonstrate substantial compliance on one or more compliance indicators (Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13;) or 2. LEA does not submit valid and reliable data for one or more indicators, including performance indicators (Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14;) or 3. LEA does not demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified through other means (e.g., UPIPS, complaints) within 10 months of written notification. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEA does not demonstrate substantial compliance on one or more compliance indicators and does not demonstrate significant progress (Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13;) and 2. Upon notification of the lack of substantial compliance and progress on one or more compliance indicators, the LEA fails to respond or implement a written plan to correct the issue within 60 days. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LEA fails to comply on one or more compliance indicators (Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13;) or 2. Upon notification of unreliable and/or invalid data or continuing noncompliance (after 10-month period), the LEA fails to respond and implement written plan to correct issue within 60 days; or 3. LEA fails to correct noncompliance which significantly affects the provision of FAPE program-wide with stated time period; or 4. LEA had indicated through action or non-action an unwillingness to comply.

Rewards and Enforcement Actions

Note: USBE may take one or more actions.

Meets Requirements	Needs Assistance (NA)	Needs Intervention (NI)	Needs Substantial Intervention (NSI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written recognition to the State and local school board. • Incentives upon request over RDA process to support ongoing LEA activities. • Notification to LEA superintendent/charter administrator and special education director regarding status. • Teacher level incentives upon request. • Additional funding upon request—LEA determines use to support PIP. • Letter of commendation from SEA special education director to LEA superintendent/charter administrator to be passed on to the local school board. • Technical assistance support (LEA determined: not part of UPIPS). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification in writing of noncompliance to LEA superintendent/charter administrator and special education director.¹ • Technical assistance to LEA (LEA selected). • Technical assistance to LEA (SEA selected). • Assist in connecting LEAs to supports and best practices in other LEAs. • Additional resources (e.g., funding, training, materials). • Additional funding—SEA determines use. • Notification in writing of status to LEA superintendent/charter administrator and special education director. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification in writing of noncompliance to LEA superintendent/charter administrator and special education director.² • Impose special conditions on IDEA Part B funding (negotiated between SEA and LEA). • Delay IDEA Part B funding until adequate compliance is achieved. • Provide a consultant to assist the LEA with implementation of the Program Improvement Plan. • Provide technical assistance to LEA to revise LEA Program Improvement Plan. • Notification in writing of status of Program Improvement Plan to LEA superintendent/charter administrator and special education director. • Use of any NA options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification in writing of noncompliance to LEA superintendent/charter administrator and special education director.³ • Review LEA progress on Program Improvement Plan on a quarterly basis. • Remove the LEA's eligibility to apply for USBE-SES discretionary grants. • Withhold IDEA Part B funding until deficiencies are corrected. • Notification in writing of noncompliance from SEA superintendent and special education director. • Notification in writing of Program Improvement Plan to local board. • Direct the administration of the LEA's special education services. • Use of any NA and/or NI options.

¹ LEA enforcement actions apply after two consecutive years.

² LEA enforcement actions apply after three consecutive years.

³ LEA enforcement actions apply at any time.

USBE SES TIERED MONITORING STRUCTURE

While the USBE continues to monitor IDEA compliance, renewed focus has been placed on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, the SES has re-conceptualized its IDEA general supervision, monitoring, and accountability systems to more effectively support LEAs in delivering compliant special education programs which lead to positive outcomes for students with disabilities. This process is called Results-Driven Accountability (RDA). Several stakeholders were involved in the revision process and provided input and feedback regarding this process.

The SES provides differentiated levels of monitoring and support to LEAs based on the LEA's level of risk. Levels of risk are determined by an annual data review conducted by the SES. Data sources used for this review are adjusted annually based on State and federal priorities and input from stakeholders, and may include compliance data, fiscal data, rates of internal monitoring, timely and accurate submission of data, APR Indicators, etc. While the SES monitoring and technical assistance efforts continue to address compliance issues, most efforts focus on working collaboratively with LEAs to develop and strengthen their capacity to implement, scale-up, and sustain LEA-level systems change that will result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

UPIPS Program Improvement Supports and Activities

LEA Requirements	Supporting	Guiding	Assisting	Coaching	Directing
General Supports and Activities					
Access to additional funding for special pilot projects or innovative approaches, upon request and availability	X				
Access to professional development and technical assistance system (i.e. UPDN)	X	X	X	X	X
Technical assistance from SEA	X	X	X	X	X
Guidelines and technical assistance manuals	X	X	X	X	X
Online resources	X	X	X	X	X
LEA data analysis with LEA steering Committee	X	X	X	X	X

LEA Requirements	Supporting	Guiding	Assisting	Coaching	Directing
Improvement Plan for LEA areas of identified need or LEA-selected areas of focus	X	X	X	X	X
Guided Supports and Activities					
Technical assistance for data review		X	X	X	X
Technical assistance for areas of identified need		X	X	X	X
LEA Data Analysis with LEA steering committee and PD/TA provider		X	X	X	X
Improvement Plan addresses USBE areas of identified need		X	X	X	X
Assisting Facilitated Supports and Activities					
Professional development on conducting a root cause analysis			X	X	X
UPIPS mentor assigned to provide technical assistance (2 hours per month)			X	X	X
Guided access to professional development and technical assistance designed to meet areas of need			X	X	X
LEA root cause analysis with LEA steering committee facilitated by PD/TA provider			X	X	X
Policy, Procedure, and Practice (PPP) review and self-assessment in areas of USBE-identified need			X	X	X

LEA Requirements	Supporting	Guiding	Assisting	Coaching	Directing
Improvement Plan reviewed by UPIPS mentor prior to submission			X	X	X
Possible USBE onsite visit to review areas of identified need			X	X	X
Coaching Thorough Supports and Activities					
UPIPS coach assigned to provide needed support (4 hours per month)				X	X
Technical assistance on conducting a self-assessment				X	X
Facilitated development of a professional development and technical assistance plan designed to meet areas of identified need				X	X
LEA root cause analysis with LEA steering committee and UPIPS coach facilitated by PD/TA provider				X	X
Additional data collection through USBE onsite visit focused on areas of identified need				X	X
Improvement Plan developed with support from UPIPS coach				X	X
Policy, Procedure, and Practice (PPP) review of entire special education program and self-assessment of areas of need				X	X
Full onsite visit scheduled for current or following school year				X	X

LEA Requirements	Supporting	Guiding	Assisting	Coaching	Directing
Directing Supports and Activities					
UPIPS coach assigned to provide in-depth support (4 hours per month)					X
External review of files for compliance					X
USBE-directed customized professional development plan					X
Additional professional development opportunities based on needs					X
Support in building LEA capacity					X
Financial supports to assist LEAs in filling programmatic needs					X
LEA root cause analysis with LEA steering committee and UPIPS coach facilitated by PD/TA provider					X
Additional data collection through USBE onsite visit					X
Multi-year Improvement Plan developed under direction of UPIPS coach					X
Policy, Procedure, and Practice (PPP) review of entire special education program and self-assessment of areas of need.					X
Intensive onsite visit scheduled for current or following school year					X

Tiered Monitoring One-Year Process

Month	Activities
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SES provides training to LEA Special Education Directors. • SES-assigned mentors and coaches begin working with LEAs in Assisting, Coaching, and Directing tiers
October–November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SES staff schedules onsite monitoring visits for LEAs with a higher risk score. • SES coaches/mentors work with higher risk LEAs to provide support. • UPIPS teams begin monitoring visits with LEAs.
December–January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SES reviews LEA data and assigns each LEA a risk score for each identified area and indicator, as described in the Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric.
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development offered on data review, root cause analysis, and Program Improvement Planning for LEAs in supporting and guiding tiers. • SES finalizes LEA risk scores, assigns preliminary monitoring tiers to each LEA, and sends letters to LEAs.
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SES staff provide data drill downs in multiple locations across the state for LEAs to look at current data and compare to state data. • LEAs work with steering committees to develop Program Improvement Plans. • LEAs may appeal preliminary monitoring tier assignments within 30 days of SES letter.
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SES reviews any additional data submitted by LEAs as well as any LEA monitoring tier assignment appeals. • Program Improvement Plans are due to UPIPS Team by April 30 if LEAs wish SES to review Program Improvement Plans and provide feedback to LEAs by June 1. • SES assigns final monitoring tiers. Final letters are sent to LEAs. • SES staff begins scheduling onsite monitoring visits for LEAs with a higher risk score.
May, June, and July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SES staff review submitted Program Improvement Plans and provide feedback to LEAs where necessary. • All Program Improvement Plans are finalized and submitted to the RDA Specialist no later than June 30. • LEAs prepare to begin implementation of Program Improvement Plan. • SES plan professional development activities for next school year.
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs begin/continue implementing Program Improvement Plans.

RDA TIER DESCRIPTIONS

Supporting Tier

Description

LEAs in the Supporting Tier demonstrate successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations, acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional development resources. LEA-specific areas of need/improvement are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA. A progress report on the PIP is submitted by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is supported by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Supports Available

LEAs in the Supporting Tier have access to funding for special pilot projects or innovative approaches that have the goal of improving outcomes for students with disabilities, and/or reducing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their general education peers. Projects must be aligned with Utah's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). LEAs have access to universal supports and activities from the USBE SES. This includes professional development and technical assistance through Utah's Professional Development Network (UPDN), SES guidelines and technical assistance manuals, and any online resources available through UPDN and SES.

Activities

LEAs in the Supporting Tier are required to conduct a data analysis with an LEA stakeholder steering committee to review the special education program and determine areas of strength and areas of need. As part of the data review, LEAs are expected to review policies, procedures, and practices within the LEA (a Policies, Procedures and Practices Review document is included in the Appendix). Additionally, the LEA steering committee should review student outcome data, APR data, compliance data, stakeholder input, and any other data the LEA has available or would like to collect. After identifying areas of need, the LEA creates a PIP to address those areas of need and submits the plan by June 30. If an LEA would prefer USBE feedback on their PIP before the due date, they should submit a draft PIP by April 30.

Guiding Tier

Description

LEAs in the Guiding Tier demonstrate successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations, acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional development resources, but have one or more areas of minor need demonstrated over a single year. SES and LEA-identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA with guidance from the SES. A progress report on the PIP is submitted by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is guided by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Supports Available

LEAs in the Guiding Tier have access to technical assistance for the LEA data review, as well as for areas of identified need. LEAs have access to universal supports with possibly some targeted supports from the USBE SES. This includes professional development and technical assistance through UPDN, SES guidelines and technical assistance manuals, and any online resources available through UPDN and SES.

Activities

LEAs in the Guiding Tier are required to conduct a data analysis with an LEA stakeholder steering committee to review the special education program and determine areas of strength and areas of need. A member of the SES and/or the UPDN will be available to guide the LEA during this process. As part of the data review, LEAs are expected to review LEA policies, procedures, and practices within the LEA (a Policies, Procedures, and Practices Review document is included in the Appendix). Additionally, the LEA steering committee should review student outcome data, APR data, compliance data, stakeholder input, and any other data the LEA has available or would like to collect. After identifying areas of need, the LEA creates a PIP to address those areas of need. If the LEA submits their draft PIP by the April 30 deadline, the USBE SES will provide feedback and an opportunity for the LEA to correct the PIP before the final June 30 deadline.

Assisting Tier

Description

LEAs in the Assisting Tier have one or more areas of moderate need demonstrated over one to three years. SES-identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA with direct assistance from the SES. A progress report on the PIP is reviewed by an SES-assigned mentor before the plan is submitted. LEA special education program implementation is assisted by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Supports Available

LEAs in the Assisting Tier are provided professional development on conducting a data review and a root cause analysis. The SES provides the LEA with support up to two hours a month by an assigned mentor. LEAs have access to targeted supports from the USBE SES. This includes professional development and technical assistance through UPDN designed to address the LEA's areas of need. LEAs have access to SES guidelines and technical assistance manuals, as well as any online resources available through UPDN and SES.

Activities

LEAs in the Assisting Tier are required to conduct a data analysis with an LEA stakeholder steering committee to review the special education program and determine areas of strength and areas of need. The USBE-SES assigned mentor assists with this process. As part of the data review, LEAs are required to review LEA policies, procedures, and practices (a Policies,

Procedures, and Practices Review document is included in the Appendix). Additionally, the LEA steering committee should review student outcome data, APR data, dispute resolution data, compliance data, stakeholder input, and any other data the LEA has available or would like to collect. Additional data on LEA-identified areas of need may be collected, either through an onsite visit or LEA data submission. After identifying areas of need, the LEA creates a PIP to address those areas of need. The LEA's assigned mentor reviews the PIP prior to the LEA submitting the plan.

Coaching Tier

Description

LEAs in the Coaching Tier have either one area of intense need or multiple areas of moderate need demonstrated over one to three years. USBE SES-identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a USBE SES and LEA jointly-developed PIP. A progress report on the PIP is reviewed by a USBE SES-assigned coach before the plan is submitted on UPIPS. LEA special education program implementation is coached by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Supports Available

LEAs in the Coaching Tier are provided with professional development on conducting a data review and a root cause analysis. The SES provides the LEA with support from an assigned coach up to four hours per month. The USBE-SES-assigned coach provides technical assistance to the LEA on conducting a self-assessment. LEAs have targeted supports with possibly some directed supports from the USBE SES. This includes facilitated access to professional development and technical assistance through UPDN designed to address the LEA's areas of need. LEAs have access to SES guidelines and technical assistance manuals, and any online resources available through UPDN and SES.

Activities

LEAs in the Coaching Tier are required to conduct a data analysis with an LEA stakeholder steering committee to review the special education program and determine areas of strength and areas of need. The USBE SES-assigned coach participates in this process. As part of the data review, LEAs are required to conduct a self-assessment of the LEA's areas of identified need. The self-assessment must include a review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices within the LEA (a Policies, Procedures, and Practices Review document is included in the Appendix). Additionally, the LEA steering committee must review student outcome data, APR data, compliance data, stakeholder input, and any other data the LEA has available or would like to collect regarding the LEA's areas of identified need. Additional data on LEA-identified areas of need are collected through an onsite visit. After identifying areas of need, the LEA creates a PIP to address those areas of need. The LEA's assigned coach assists the LEA in developing the PIP. LEAs in this tier are required to submit their PIP on April 30 in order to receive feedback from the monitoring team before the June 30 deadline. A full SEA onsite visit may be scheduled for the current or following school year.

Directing Tier

Description

LEAs in the Directing Tier have multiple areas of intensive need and/or needs demonstrated over several years. USBE SES identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a SES and LEA jointly-developed multi-year PIP. A coach is assigned by the SES to follow up with the LEA on progress toward the PIP up to four hours per month. At a minimum, a written progress report based on the PIP is submitted by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is directed by the SEA for LEAs in this tier.

Supports Available

LEAs in the Directing Tier are provided with intensive support from a coach assigned by the SES up to six hours per month. Support includes professional development on conducting a data review and a root cause analysis. LEAs have directed customized access through UPDN to professional development and technical assistance designed to address the LEA's areas of need. Additional professional development opportunities are available to the LEA based on the LEA's needs. The SES provides support to the LEA in building capacity LEA-wide, and financial supports are available to assist the LEA in filling programmatic needs. The SES-assigned coach provides support to the LEA in conducting a self-assessment. LEAs have access to SES Guidelines, technical assistance manuals, and any online resources available through UPDN and SES.

Activities

LEAs in the Directing Tier are required to conduct a data analysis with an LEA stakeholder steering committee to review the special education program and determine areas of strength and areas of need. The coach assigned by the SES participates in this process. As part of the data review, LEAs are required to conduct a self-assessment around the LEA's areas of identified need. The self-assessment must include a review of policies, procedures, and practices within the LEA (a listing of areas to be reviewed is included in the appendix). Additionally, the LEA steering committee must review student outcome data, APR data, compliance data, stakeholder input, and any other data the LEA has available or would like to collect regarding the LEA's areas of identified need. The SES conducts a review of the LEA's student special education files for compliance with IDEA. Additional data on LEA-identified areas of need are collected through an onsite visit. After identifying areas of need, the LEA creates a multi-year PIP to address those areas of need. The LEA's assigned coach assists the LEA in developing the PIP. LEAs in this tier are required to submit their PIP on April 30 in order to receive feedback from the monitoring team before the June 30 deadline. A Policies, Procedures, and Practices Review document is available in the Appendix. A full monitoring visit may be scheduled for the current or following school year.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The subcommittees of the LEA Stakeholder Steering Committee collect different kinds of information from a variety of sources. The Stakeholder Steering Committee considers data from a broad representation of stakeholders.

Stakeholder Steering Committee

Purpose

The Stakeholder Steering Committee ensures that all stakeholders are involved and have input into the LEA data review and program improvement process.

Committee Membership Requirements

The Stakeholder Steering Committee should be representative of the size and demographics of the LEA, and should include at a minimum:

- The special education director.
- A school administrator.
- A general education teacher.
- A special education teacher (including preschool, if applicable).
- A parent of a student with disabilities.
- A student with disabilities, if appropriate.

Committee Membership Options

Others to consider adding as Stakeholder Steering Committee members:

- Related service staff
- Other agency personnel
- Facilitator
- Directors/staff from other LEA programs
 - YIC
 - Online personnel
- Those who affect and are affected by special education systems

Interview Data

One important source of information about the LEA's special education programs is interviews with stakeholders. Interviews may be conducted with principals, teachers, parents, related service providers, paraprofessionals, and students. Suggested interview and focus group questions can be accessed on the [UPIPS page of the USBE website](https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/lawsrulesregulations?mid=942&tid=4) at <https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/lawsrulesregulations?mid=942&tid=4>.

LEAs may choose to conduct focus groups or a written survey and should determine the number of stakeholders needed to be representative of the LEA. The LEA should consider the information gained from conducting interviews and analyzing the results when writing the PIP.

Student Record Review Data

Another critical place to look for information is in the records of student with disabilities. Student files should be checked for compliance with requirements of IDEA. This is accomplished using the LEA Internal Monitoring tool. The LEA must develop and submit an internal monitoring process to the USBE UPIPS Specialist for approval. The following analysis of the student record review data must be considered when writing the PIP:

- Number and percent of special education files reviewed
- How various ages, disability categories, placements, English Learners (EL), initial/reevaluation students were represented in reviewed files (ensure files of low-incidence disabilities are reviewed)
- Files from Youth In Custody and Adult Education, if applicable to the LEA
- Information about the district/school-wide results of the review for each compliance item
- Analysis of the file review results, identifying systemic areas of noncompliance
- Strengths of the special education program
- Program improvement and corrective action goals based on the analysis

NOTE: All noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, and in no case later than ten months.

Outcome Data

Information on student outcomes may be obtained from a number of sources. One helpful source is the data from the OSEP reports presented in the LEA Data Profile and APR data. The subcommittee with this assignment needs to analyze and report these data points:

- Graduation rate of students with disabilities compared to non-disabled students (APR Indicator 1)
- Dropout rate of students with disabilities compared to non-disabled students (APR Indicator 2)
- Trend data for graduation and dropout rates
- Classroom observation data
- LRE/placement data for students with disabilities compared with state and national averages for students ages 6–21 and 3–5 (APR Indicators 5–6)
- Academic achievement data on state wide end of year assessments and the alternative assessments for students with disabilities compared to non-disabled students and with state averages (APR Indicator 3)
- Trend data on academic achievement
- Participation rate of students with disabilities in statewide assessment (APR Indicator 3)
- Suspension and expulsion rates of students with disabilities (APR Indicator 4)
- Representation of various ethnic backgrounds of students with disabilities compared to the general student population of district, and possible implications for the eligibility process (APR Indicator 9)
- Representation of students in various categories of disability compared to state averages (APR Indicator 10)

- Satisfaction data from the interviews with parents and staff referenced above (Indicator 8)
- Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) data (APR Indicator 7)
- Post-school outcomes data (APR Indicator 14)

Other Data Sources

Each Stakeholder Steering Committee looks at other important information about other factors that affect the quality of the special education program. The results of the policies, procedures, and practices review are analyzed, along with other considerations. These elements are considered in the Improvement Plan:

- Teacher licenses and endorsements for current assignments
- Caseloads of special education case managers
- Adequacy of LEA support for teachers in schools (e.g. staffing, leadership, supervision, and professional development)
- The LEA system for identifying personnel development needs
- Records of personnel development activities provided for all members of IEP team (including LEA representative, general education teachers, special education teachers, and parents)
- How the LEA ensures timely and accurate data (i.e., what procedures are in place for editing and validating data)
- Policies and procedures in place and followed LEA-wide
- Strengths, needed improvements, and areas of noncompliance from this information

Other Data at LEA Discretion

LEAs may access information from many other sources. The analysis of this data should also be considered in the PIP.

Internal Student Record Review Guidelines

December 1 Child Count	Number of Records to Review
Up to 500	20 Records (or All)
501–900	35 Records
901–1300	45 Records
1301–1700	55 Records
1701–2000	65 Records
2001–4000	75 Records
4001–6000	100 Records
6001–8000	140 Records
8001–10,000	180 Records
10,000–up	200 Records

Records reviewed must be a representative sample of the LEA and include:

- Preschool, elementary, middle school, and high school files across the LEA geographically
- Special schools, including YIC, Adult Education, and online programs (if any)
- All ethnicities
- All disability categories

NOTE: In order to get a representative sample, the LEA may need to increase the number of files reviewed.

IDENTIFICATION AND CORRECTION OF IDEA NONCOMPLIANCE

Identification of Noncompliance

The USBE SES reviews data collected from LEA during onsite visits to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and the USBE SER. LEAs have the option to correct areas of potential noncompliance within three weeks of data collection before the USBE issues written findings of noncompliance. The USBE SES reviews the additional data submitted by the LEA to verify whether the data demonstrate compliance, and issues a written finding if the data demonstrate noncompliance. If the USBE identifies noncompliance, the LEA will be notified in writing of the noncompliance, the citation of the area (IDEA and/or USBE SER), and of the requirement that the noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than ten months from identification. A written letter of findings will be sent to the superintendent/Director of the LEA.

Note: Noncompliance identified through the LEA Internal File Review tool is not subject to USBE review; however, noncompliance identified through internal review must still be corrected by the LEA within ten months of identification.

Correction of Noncompliance

The United States Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires that all noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance. The USBE SES has made an effort to create a method that will require the least amount of time and effort for LEAs while providing the SES with evidence verifying corrections.

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

Prong 1: Correcting Each Individual Case of Noncompliance

To document that individual student-level noncompliance is corrected, LEAs must demonstrate that the student file is compliant with regulatory requirements. For any noncompliance concerning **child-specific requirements that are not subject to a specific timeline requirement**, the LEA must submit documentation that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. These items include requirements such as:

- Eligibility determination is not current or complete.
- Eligibility criteria are not met.
- Evaluation Summary Report is not current or complete.
- IEP is not current or complete.
- IEP content does not meet criteria (i.e., measurable goals, Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) statements include current data

and how the disability affects progress in the general curriculum, statewide assessment, Extended School Year (ESY) decision, etc.).

- Consent for Initial Placement is missing or unsigned by parents.
- Copy to Parent documentation is missing.
- Transition Plan is missing or incomplete.
- Age of Majority notification is missing.
- Language proficiency and assessment documentation missing.
- Prior Written Notice is missing.
- Documentation that Procedural Safeguards were provided to parents is missing.
- Documentation of IEP and eligibility team participation is missing.
- Change in Placement is missing.

Method:

The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and uploading the evidence on the Individual Student Noncompliance report received from the SEA.

For any noncompliance concerning **child-specific timeline requirements**, the LEA must submit documentation to the SEA that the required action (e.g., the evaluation, reevaluation, or IEP) was completed, though late.

Prong 2: Correctly Implementing the Specific Regulatory Requirements (i.e., Subsequently Achieved 100% Compliance), Based on the SEA Review of the Updated Data

To document that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, the LEA must review additional student special education files, regardless of the level of noncompliance, and submit documentation that the LEA has achieved 100% compliance. The number of additional files reviewed by the LEA will be determined based on the identified root cause of noncompliance.

Method:

The LEA documents the required evidence by uploading the evidence on the Verification of Compliance (Prong 2) report received from the SES on the UPIPS website.

The SES is committed to supporting LEA efforts to improve results for students with disabilities through the framework of compliance.

APPENDIX

Policies, Procedures, and Practices Review

As part of the LEA data review, the LEA should review the following data to ensure that this information is consistent with federal regulations and USBE SER . Although for most LEAs this data review is optional, it is highly recommended that all data points are reviewed to ensure continued compliance.

A. Forms

LEAs use a variety of standard forms and materials for documenting state and federal special education requirements. Since a majority of these forms and materials are required to address specific information, an LEA must ensure that their content is consistent with federal regulations and USBE SER.

State Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
Procedural Safeguards Notice	IV.E	Current Procedural Safeguards
Revocation of Consent	III.T	Blank form
Notice of Meeting Purposes, time, date, location, name/role, bring others	IV.B	Blank form
Consent to Evaluate/Reevaluation	II.C IV.F	Blank form
Review of Existing Data	II.H	Blank form
Evaluation Summary Report	II.I	Blank form
Determination of Eligibility for each disability category	II.I II.J	Blank form

State Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
Individualized Education Program Assessment Addendum PLAAFP and goals Progress—how measured/reported to parents Special factors and ESY Services, amount, and frequency Initiation date and duration Review of placement Participate extracurricular activities Signatures	III.J	Blank form
Transition Plan Goals and interests Age-appropriate assessments Services Course of study Agencies and responsibilities	III.J VII.B	Blank form
Service Plan for Private Schools and Home School (NA for charter schools)	VI.B VI.D	Blank form
Consent to Invite Outside Agencies for Transition Planning	VII.B	Blank form
Consent for Initial Placement	III.T IV.F	Blank form
Change of Placement	IV.D	Blank form
Notice Regarding Age of Majority Rights	IV.W VII.B	Blank form
Summary of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance	III.J.	Blank form
Record of Access	IV.X	Blank form
Access Authorization	IV.X	Blank form

B. Child Find System

Review Child Find documents that demonstrate the LEA’s efforts to identify, locate and evaluate all students, including students ages 0–21, students in private schools including

religious school students, highly mobile students such as migrant and homeless, YIC, and students advancing from grade to grade who are suspected of being students with a disability and in need of special education and related services.

Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
<p>LEA develops policies and procedures consistent with Part B of the IDEA and State Rules, to ensure all student with disabilities residing within the jurisdiction of the LEA, 0–21 (including private schools) regardless of the severity of the disability, and who are in need of sped/related services, are identified, located and evaluated. <u>Includes practical method for determining which students are currently receiving needed sped/related services.</u></p>	<p>II.A</p>	<p>Review LEA Policy and Procedures manual, revise as needed, and submit to SES for approval. Requirements for the Policy and Procedures manual can be found at the USBE Laws, Policies, and Procedures website (https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/lawsrulesregulations?mid=942&tid=0).</p>
<p>LEA implementation and coordination of Child Find activities, including private schools within a school districts jurisdiction.</p>	<p>II.A</p>	<p>Description of method for counting students involved in the Child Find process. A copy of the form or system used for tracking the time period of the evaluation and timelines for reevaluation. Documentation to show that private schools located with the boundaries of the school district were included and provided with information (see “Private schools” below).</p>
<p>LEA applies requirement to highly mobile students with disabilities, such as students who are migrant and homeless.</p>	<p>II.A</p>	<p>Documentation of active attempts to include highly mobile students in the Child Find process; for example: flyers, information in languages other than English, newspaper announcements, newsletters, school handbooks, etc.</p>
<p>LEA applies requirement to suspected students with disabilities advancing from grade to grade.</p>	<p>II.A</p>	<p>Agenda from school faculty/staff training on referral process and Child Find responsibility, school handbooks, memos</p>

Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
Collaboration/coordination with state and local Depts. of Health or other provider of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities, ages birth-two (Part C program) for school districts.	II.A	Interagency agreements, MOUs, copies of meeting agendas Note: If this area is not applicable for your LEA, please include a statement describing the reason.
LEA ensures that parents are notified of the Carson Smith Scholarship program.	R277-602-4	Documentation that written notice of the availability of a scholarship to attend a private school through the Carson Smith Scholarship Program was sent to parents or guardians of students who have an IEP. Documentation must include evidence that notice was provided annually, no later than February 1, for all students who have IEPs. Notice must be provided no later than 30 days after a student is found eligible for special education services initially. Ensure notice includes a link to the Carson Smith Scholarship website (https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/scholarships)
LEA posted the Carson Smith Scholarship website on the LEA's website.	R277-602-4	Provide a link to the LEA's website where above link is posted.

C. Identification and Evaluation

Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
<p>Evaluation materials, tests, and assessment tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic achievement: math, reading, written language Adaptive/self-help Autism checklist(s) Cognitive/general intelligence Communication/speech/language Emotional/behavioral/social Health/physical development Motor abilities Sensory-vision/hearing Transition assessments Native language Other modes of communication English proficiency Parental input Observation materials (teacher, service providers, etc.) Classroom-based assessment 	<p>II.F</p>	<p>Review the form following this section (page 40–44) <u>for each area.</u></p>
<p>Evaluator qualifications</p>	<p>II.F</p>	<p>List the personnel responsible for administering each assessment and his/her qualifications, including certificates of training and/or license number (CACTUS ID or DOPL).</p>

D. Personnel

Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
Surrogate parent	IV.V	List names and contact information of people who have completed surrogate parent training and have agreed to serve as a surrogate parent for the LEA.
Educator license requirements	IX.H	List of the names of the teachers, their assignments, and CACTUS ID numbers.
Interpreter qualifications	VIII.K	<p>Documentation of the number of students who have a hearing loss, the number of students using American Sign Language or other manual communication system and copies of credentials for all sign language interpreters. Credentials must be issued by an agency approved by the Utah Interpreter Board.</p> <p>If the LEA does not currently have any students with a need for an interpreter, the LEA will provide documentation of the LEAs procedure for obtaining a qualified interpreter.</p>
Interpreter assurance	VIII.K	Provide an assurance that all students receiving academic content through sign language or any manual communication system have access to a certified interpreter, transliterator or direct instruction from a licensed and endorsed educator in the sign language or manual communication system used by the student. If the LEA does not currently have students with interpreter needs, the LEA must provide an assurance that if a student enters the LEA with a need for an interpreter, the above requirements will be met.

E. Private Schools (NA for Charter Schools)

Requirements	USBE Special Education Rule	Documentation/Evidence
Documentation of the number of parentally placed private school students evaluated, the number determined to be students with disabilities, and the number of students served	VI.B	Provide a table which includes the number of parentally placed private school students evaluated, the number determined to be students with disabilities, and the number of students served.
Documentation of annual consultation with each nonprofit private school within the LEA’s boundaries regarding Child Find, proportionate share, services provided by LEA, and disagreement actions, as well as affirmation from private school	VI.B	Include copies of letters, phone records, meeting notes, and written affirmation signed by representatives of the private schools, or documentation of refusal of consultation.

F. Fiscal Compliance and Accountability Monitoring (FiCAM) Checklists

The LEA reviews current fiscal policies and procedures in order to complete and submit the General Fiscal Compliance Checklist. The checklist provides the opportunity for LEAs to explain how they are conducting their own compliance monitoring of fiscal requirements.

Based on results of the General Fiscal Compliance Checklist, the LEA may need to complete additional checklists. These additional checklists allow the LEA to provide more detail in the areas of equitable services for students who are parentally placed in private schools (proportionate share), coordinated early intervening services, school-wide Title I programs, and/or high-cost students. Revised checklists are submitted as part of the Utah Consolidated Application (UCA) for funding.

Parent Focus Group Questions

Yes/No/NA Questions

Were your procedural safeguards (parent rights) explained so you understood them?

A student can be evaluated once a year and must be evaluated every three years to be determined eligible for an individualized education program (IEP). Did you have the opportunity to provide input during your student's evaluation?

Was your student's IEP meeting scheduled at a mutually agreed upon time?

Did at least one of your student's general education teacher attend the IEP meeting?

Did the principal or his/her representative attend the IEP meeting?

Did the team ask for and use your input on goals for your student's IEP?

Does the staff in the general classroom consistently provide the accommodations and modifications written in your student's IEP?

Do you know if your student is getting all services and time listed on the IEP?

Open Ended Questions

What input were you able to give to the school team during the evaluation process?

How do you know your student is making progress toward meeting the goal(s) on his/her IEP?

If your student is 14 years or older, what transition services were discussed during the IEP meeting?

What has the school done to help you understand graduation requirements?

If your student is 3–5 years old, tell us about your preschool experience.

How does your school welcome and engage families?

In what ways are you connecting with the school? If you are not, what is holding you back?

Discuss the strengths of your student's special education program.

Discuss and suggest any area of improvement for the special education program in your school.

Do you have any other questions or issues you would like to discuss?