

UT Part B

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

In FFY 2015, Utah either met or was in significant compliance with 18 of 30 possible targets on the applicable Part B APR indicators. These included indicators measuring dropout, assessment proficiency, discipline, LRE (ages 6-21), preschool outcomes statement 2 (i.e., functioning within age expectations), parent input, disproportionality, and compliance indicators 11-12. During FFY 2015, Utah participated in a new end-of-year only alternate assessment, the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), causing Indicator 3C to be recalculated as a baseline year, and not comparable to previous calculations.

Impacting preschool outcomes, Utah missed three indicators measuring preschool outcomes Summary Statement 1. Although those targets were missed, Utah continues to demonstrate high levels of preschool achievement in comparison nationally, ranging between 87%-91%. Additionally, implementation of a new state law allowing parents to refuse participation in a statewide assessment resulted in a decrease in the participation rates of students with disabilities. Indicator 13 shows a slight decline from previous high rates of compliance, and will continue to be an area of priority in the state, as the impact on Indicator 14 also requires improvement.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

146

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

Utah's General Supervision Process

The Utah State Board of Education, Special Education Services (USBE SES) has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities.

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system is called the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) and is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE staff review of each Local Education Agency's (LEAs) 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 a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEAs level of identified need.

USBE SES's results-driven accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the federal intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process.

UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of 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 State Educational Agency (SEA) according to the LEAs 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.

While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis of episodic procedural monitoring to one of active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results.

The monitoring system has five major objectives:

- Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities by linking LEA data, including APR data, to improvement efforts.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Ensure compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules.
- Connect LEA-level and school-level improvement efforts with IDEA requirements.
- Support each school district and charter school in the process of self-assessment, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and program effectiveness.
- Link program improvement activities with long-range, multi-year professional development planning.

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

- An effective accountability system is continuous rather than episodic, is linked to systemic change, and integrates self-assessment with continuous feedback and response.
- Partnership with stakeholders. The LEA works in partnership with diverse stakeholders. This collaboration affects the following areas: the collection and analysis of self-assessment data; the identification of critical issues and solutions to problems; and the development, implementation, and oversight of improvement strategies to ensure compliance and improved results for students with disabilities.
- LEA accountability. LEAs are accountable for identifying strengths and areas of concern based upon data analysis; identifying, implementing and revising strategies for program improvement; and submitting annual measurement and progress reports.
- Self-Assessment. Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a Self-Assessment process that focuses on improving results for students with disabilities.
- Data-driven process. The improvement process in each LEA is driven by data that focuses on improved results for students with disabilities. Each LEA collects and uses data on an ongoing basis, 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 include APR indicators, personnel needs, graduation and dropout rates, performance of students with disabilities on state- and district-wide assessments, rates at which students with disabilities are suspended and/or expelled from school, and rates of identification and placement of students from minority backgrounds.
- Technical assistance. The focus of the monitoring process is on continuous improvement; therefore technical assistance is a critical component of the process. Key components of technical assistance are the identification and dissemination of promising practices and professional development. LEAs are encouraged to include these components as part of their program improvement plan.

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible and generally within one month of discovery. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and Utah Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In addition, LEAs are required to write a program improvement plan to address their process for ensuring that the regulatory requirements are being implemented correctly throughout the LEA. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of overdue evaluation(s), Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), etc. LEAs whose program improvement plan does not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds.

Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices and the USBE SES verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE SES followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. That includes accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance, requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance, and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, including the correction of noncompliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, based upon the USBE SES's review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%.

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

Supporting Tier

LEAs in the Supporting Tier demonstrate 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 Program Improvement Plan (PIP) developed by the LEA. A progress report on the PIP is submitted to the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is supported by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Guiding Tier

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 to the Results-Driven Accountability Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is guided by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Assisting Tier

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 a SES-assigned mentor before the plan is submitted to the RDA Specialist. LEA special education program implementation is assisted by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Coaching Tier

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 to the Results-Driven Accountability Specialist. LEA special education program implementation is coached by the SES for LEAs in this tier.

Directing Tier

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 six hours per month. At a minimum, a written progress report based on the PIP is submitted to the RDA Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is directed by the SEA for LEAs in this tier.

Technical assistance providers are vetted by the USBE SES to ensure adequate subject matter knowledge and to ensure that consistent, accurate, and evidence-based information is disseminated. Evaluation systems are in place to determine impact and effectiveness of TA on teacher behavior and student outcomes.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

The Utah Professional Development Network (UPDN) addresses Utah's special education professional development (PD) needs. The UPDN consists of multiple components intentionally focused on positively affecting the results of students with disabilities. Irrespective of established results-driven accountability and compliance priorities, this model incorporates the vital professional development elements strengthening teacher practice, and subsequent student learning. Importantly, the UPDN model identifies the component parts, including the need for tiered LEA supports as identified by both the UPIPS process and through LEA request. Stakeholders, using data analysis, developed UPDN priorities. All professional development (PD) is evidence-based. Offered at the top of the model, is a ten-item description of the operating UPDN model.

Ten Item Model Summary

1. Using the APR, data, and advice from the UPDN Advisory Board and stakeholders, the USBE SES leadership set PD priorities. These priorities include school-to-post-school transition, effective instruction, and student engagement in mathematics and reading/English language arts. All priorities directly impact college and career readiness and prepare students with disabilities for skilled and competitive employment, involvement in post-secondary education, and independent living.
2. The UPDN Core Team, in collaboration with the USBE SES, organizes priority-driven PD for all LEAs, recognizing that all LEAs receive universal-level PD.
3. LEAs request UPDN support associated with identified PD priorities or needs specific to their respective LEA using the "single point of entry" internet-based request system. They click on a "need assistance" button and fill out a brief form, including contact information.
4. Within 48 hours, a UPDN team member contacts the person requesting assistance to discuss their LEAs respective needs and directs the person requesting assistance to an approved provider.
5. The UPDN system screens "approved providers" that can plan, deliver and evaluate PD to LEA staff upon request.
6. LEAs receive differentiated levels of support based on results and compliance data as well as by LEA request.
7. The coordinated system of PD improves results for students with disabilities, as measured by outcome data.
8. Internal evaluation is systematically conducted, assessing the quality, relevance, and fidelity of PD events.
9. The entire UPDN system is externally evaluated annually to determine if the project is addressing identified goals.

Attachments

2/7/2017

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

During FFY 2015, in preparation for the APR and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), requirements and indicators continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. Changes and updates in OSEP requirements were articulated during these meetings. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum, as well as Leading by Convening, as a strategy to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Each February, the State reports to the public on its progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The APR is posted on the USBE's website (<http://schools.utah.gov/sars/Data/Performance.aspx>). The final APR is shared at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Utah State Board of Education and USEAP, and with the LEA Special Education Directors after submission. Results are also shared with the Utah Parent Center, Utah's Parent Training and Information Center. 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 report is posted on the USBE website (<http://schools.utah.gov/sars/Data/Performance.aspx>) and is made available for posting on LEA websites.

The results of the FFY 2015 APR were reported to the Utah State Board of Education in the February 2017 Board meeting.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

--

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			73.40%	73.30%	85.70%	85.70%	83.00%	71.80%	71.80%	62.13%	66.32%
Data		73.20%	72.90%	71.10%	81.00%	81.00%	85.10%	58.60%	60.91%	65.02%	68.23%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	69.59%	71.48%	72.91%	74.37%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Utah's Elementary and Secondary Schools Act (ESEA) graduation rate targets, as per the U.S. Department of Education approved (08-05-11) Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, require Utah schools/LEAs to have graduation rates of 85.7% [or, if the school's/LEA's graduation rate is less than 85.7%, it must achieve a 2% increase (i.e., previous year data * 1.02) of the previous year's rate].

The previous (07/23/15) Utah ESEA Flexibility Waiver, which was in effect at the time of this data period, discusses graduation rates of less than 60% resulting in priority school status, but does not contain a revised state graduation target. Instead, Utah's Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS), described in Utah's ESEA Flexibility Waiver, requires that graduation rates of each school be examined and used during calculations. A target graduation rate is not included in UCAS documents. Utah is in the process of developing a new Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) state plan.

As neither document specifically addresses state targets for graduation, and Utah stakeholders felt that a 60% target was not appropriately rigorous, **Utah will apply the target of either 85.7% or a 2% increase of the previous year as the state graduation target.** However, the Grads 360 structure does not allow for that flexibility, so starting with the FFY 2013 target, it required a 2% increase from the FFY 2012 state rate of 60.91% and the remaining year's targets are listed as projected targets starting with FFY 2015 and will be revised to show the required 2% increase if the annual target of 85.7% is not met. FFY 2015 targets were based off of the FFY 2014 data of 68.23%.

Both documents were presented to stakeholders at State Board meetings and disseminated publicly for comment prior to finalization and approval. As the new Utah ESSA Plan is completed in 2017, stakeholder input and public meetings will continue to be held, to ensure stakeholder engagement throughout the process.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,737	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,029	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	67.93%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
2,737	4,029	68.23%	69.59%	67.93%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Beginning FFY 2012, the staff of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) applied a formula for the cohort graduation rate required by the ESEA and specifically approved for use in Utah by the U.S. Department of Education. The graduation rate calculation is based on the number of students who enter 9th grade and graduate with their cohort. The calculation is:

Number of on-time graduates in the cohort

Number of 9th graders in the cohort minus the number of students who transferred out of the public education system

The following students are considered "Other Completers" and are not included in the graduation rate calculation: students who earned a high school diploma after their cohort graduated; students with disabilities who participated in the Utah Alternative Assessment (UAA) and/or Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) due to their need for instruction in alternate standards aligned with the Utah Core Standards; and students who received a Utah High School Completion Diploma by passing the General Education Development (GED) test.

To graduate with a regular high school diploma, all students (including students with disabilities) are required to meet State minimum course credit requirements, as specified in USBE Administrative Rule R277-700; LEAs may require additional course credits beyond the State minimum. Students who meet the state and LEA course credit requirements are awarded a regular high school diploma. Any student who is exiting the school system and has not meet all graduation requirements may, at the discretion of the LEA, be awarded a Certificate of Completion, which is not considered a regular high school diploma.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There are 118 students from the 2015 cohort of students with disabilities who graduated by the end of SY 2016, bringing the graduation rate up from the four year cohort of 67.9% to 70.9% for the five year cohort.

In total, 693 (53.6%) of the nongraduates from the 2015 cohort of students with disabilities enrolled in school during 2016 and/or 2017, and 445 enrolled in 2017. Thus, a majority of the nongraduates who have returned to school are still enrolled.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.80%	4.70%	4.70%	5.60%	5.55%	5.43%	5.32%	42.00%	39.90%
Data		4.90%	4.80%	4.80%	5.65%	4.50%	4.20%	8.90%	7.70%	42.00%	30.30%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	37.90%	36.00%	34.20%	32.49%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE Special Education Services (SES) statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrators Meeting (USEAM).

During FFY 2013 and 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,043	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	146	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	114	113
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	2,576	1,411
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	18	null

Explanation of Alternate Data

The 009 file submitted in October 2015 and used to pre-populate this form was subsequently reviewed and found to contain major errors. The file was resubmitted in July 2016 with corrections. Exiters erroneously included in the October 2015 file and corrected in the later submission included counting the following students as dropouts: students continuing in school after their cohort had graduated (continuing students are not considered dropouts); students who had been medically withdrawn from school (an exclusionary condition for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of dropout); and students enrolled in higher education and colleges of applied technology (considered continuing students under federal cohort graduation rate calculations).

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Utah students with disabilities are entitled to a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) until age 22; school exit is determined based on when during the school year the student's birthday occurs (Utah Code 53A-15-301). The exit status of one Utah student reported as reaching maximum age for eligibility changed in the interval between the original 009 submission (October 2015) and the submission of the corrected file (July 2016) as the exit code originally submitted by the LEA was invalid for that student.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,411	4,731	30.30%	37.90%	29.82%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup**

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

This indicator is no longer required due to the passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	97.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.30%	99.53%	99.62%	99.70%	99.60%	99.49%	99.56%	98.17%	96.43%
Math	A Overall	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	98.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.00%	97.70%	98.10%	99.50%	99.70%	99.40%	99.12%	99.70%	98.04%	96.23%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Utah consistently has high participation rates; however, with the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a newly implemented and complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards which was first administered in 2013–2014, Utah will maintain the required participation rates.

During FFY 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP Phase II, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	46,386	43,348	96.43%	95.00%	93.45%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Utah has generally had high participation rates; however, once the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment was implemented in 2013–2014, which was the year for Utah to re-establish participation baseline, there was a slight decline in participation. In FFY 2014, two additional factors came into play in Utah's statewide assessments that had a direct impact on participation. First, FFY 2014 was the first year of implementation of the DLM (Dynamic Learning Maps) alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Second, during FFY 2014 Utah lawmakers also passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of standardized testing, which hadn't previously been explicitly stated in Utah State Code. That law was further clarified in FFY 2015, allowing parents to exclude their children from "any assessment" that is mandated on a state or federal level. As a result, Utah's parental opt out of all students from statewide assessments increased from 3.2% in 2014 to 5% in 2015. Parental opt out of students with disabilities increased from 3.7% in 2014 to 6.5% in 2015, impacting the ability of USBE to reach the required target of 95% participation.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

During FFY 2015, Utah has continued to leverage the SSIP in three targeted areas: high expectations for all students, multi-tiered systems of supports in secondary settings, and giving students continued access to core instruction. Information regarding requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors, presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and through online publication of the Spedometer newsletter. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	46,086	43,106	96.23%	95.00%	93.53%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Utah has generally had high participation rates; however, once the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment was implemented in 2013–2014, which was the year for Utah to re-establish participation baseline, there was a slight decline in participation. In FFY 2014, two additional factors came into play in Utah's statewide assessments that had a direct impact on participation. First, FFY 2014 was the first year of implementation of the DLM (Dynamic Learning Maps) alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Second, during FFY 2014 Utah lawmakers also passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of standardized testing, which hadn't previously been explicitly stated in Utah State Code. That law was further clarified in FFY 2015, allowing parents to exclude their children from "any assessment" that is mandated on a state or federal level. As a result, Utah's parental opt out of all students from statewide assessments increased from 3.2% in 2014 to 5% in 2015. Parental opt out of students with disabilities increased from 3.7% in 2014 to 6.5% in 2015, impacting the ability of USBE to reach the required target of 95% participation.

During FFY 2015, Utah has continued to leverage the SSIP in three targeted areas: high expectations for all students, multi-tiered systems of supports in secondary settings, and giving students continued access to core instruction. Information regarding requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors, presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and through online publication of the Spedometer newsletter. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://datagateway.schools.utah.gov/>

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A 3-8	2015	Target ≥					83.00%	83.00%	83.00%		62.00%	17.38%	13.44%
			Data					48.19%	48.96%	51.00%	52.08%	51.61%	17.38%	13.44%
	B 10-12	2015	Target ≥					82.00%	82.00%	82.00%		63.16%	13.05%	8.67%
			Data					45.58%	50.63%	53.58%	54.39%	52.65%	13.05%	8.67%
Math	A 3-8	2015	Target ≥					45.00%	45.00%	45.00%		58.39%	20.11%	17.06%
			Data					42.05%	45.95%	46.43%	45.79%	47.11%	20.11%	17.06%
	B 10-12	2015	Target ≥					40.00%	40.00%			42.38%	7.86%	7.15%
			Data					40.00%	37.53%	25.67%	26.05%	22.96%	7.86%	7.15%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ 3-8	15.48%	16.98%	18.48%	19.98%
	B ≥ 10-12	8.50%	10.00%	11.50%	13.00%
Math	A ≥ 3-8	17.61%	19.61%	21.61%	23.61%
	B ≥ 10-12	7.08%	9.08%	11.08%	13.08%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Utah had planned to reestablish targets for FFY 2015-2018 during FFY 2015 in order to align with baseline data after moving to new assessments. In school year 2013-14, Utah changed assessments from the Criterion-Referenced Tests (CRTs) to the Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) assessment. In school year 2014-15, Utah changed alternate assessments from the Utah Alternate Assessment (UAA) to the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) assessment for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. These assessments are based on new academic achievement standards, both for the regular and alternate assessment, which reflect grade-level rigorous content.

Utah has some data to consider for the DLM alternate assessment after moving from the year-end model in FFY 2014 to the integrated model in FFY 2015. The integrated model uses different cut scores than the year-end to determine proficiency. Utah has consistent assessment trend data for SAGE. After evaluating the trend data for the SAGE assessment and using the new DLM baseline data, Utah was able to determine realistic and rigorous targets. While reestablishing targets for indicator 3C, Utah also considered the aggressive goal of the Utah State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) to reduce the achievement gap in mathematics for students with disabilities in grades six through eight for students with SLI and SLD by 50% in 5 years.

In analyzing the trend data for ELA, Utah's students with disabilities proficiency rate has increased by an average of 0.95 percentage points per year for grades 3-8 and 0.65 percentage points for grade 10 from FFY 2013-15. These trend data points are for the SAGE assessment only, as the DLM does not currently have trend data available due to the change in administration described previously. With consideration of the SAGE trend data, and the DLM, Utah proposes using new targets for ELA, which reflect an increase of 1.5 percentage points per year, resulting in FFY 2018 targets of 19.98% for grades 3-8 and 13.00% for grade 10.

In analyzing the trend data for mathematics, Utah's students with disabilities proficiency rate has increased by an average of 1.65 percentage points per year for grades 3-8 (which includes the grades the SSIP is targeting) and 0.85 percentage points for grade 10 from FFY 2013-15. These trend data points are for the SAGE assessment only as the DLM alternate assessment does not currently have trend data available due to the change in administration described previously. With consideration of the SAGE trend data, the DLM, and the SSIP goal, Utah proposes new targets for mathematics, which reflect an increase of two percentage points per year, resulting in FFY 2018 mathematics targets of 23.61% for grades 3-8 and 13.08% for grade 10.

Proposed proficiency targets are outlined below:

	SWD FFY 2015 proficiency rate	Proposed increase per year	Adjusted FFY 2016 Target	Adjusted FFY 2017 Target	Adjusted FFY 2018 Target
Reading/ELA Grades 3-8	15.48%	1.50%	16.98%	18.48%	19.98%
Reading/ELA Grade 10	8.50%	1.50%	10.00%	11.50%	13.00%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Mathematics	Grades 3-8	17.61%	2.00%	19.61%	21.61%	23.61%
Mathematics	Grade 10	7.08%	2.00%	9.08%	11.08%	13.08%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2015, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. Data on the proficiency rates of SWD on the DLM Alternate Assessment and proficiency and trend rates of SWD on the SAGE assessment were shared with stakeholders. These discussions resulted in the proposed new Indicator 3c targets. The proposed targets were shared at a quarterly meeting of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP) and with LEA Special Education Directors. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were amended for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A 3-8	39,242	6,076	13.44%	15.48%	15.48%
B 10-12	4,106	349	8.67%	8.50%	8.50%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A 3-8	38,811	6,835	17.06%	17.61%	17.61%
B 10-12	4,295	304	7.15%	7.08%	7.08%

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://datagateway.schools.utah.gov/>

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			3.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		4.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrators Meeting (USEAM).

During FFY 2013, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	142	0%	0%	0%

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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2015 State rate (based on the 2014–2015 data) for 2/7/2017

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.03%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.03% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged. Only 16 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and also suspended any students with disabilities in 2014–2015. Note that across the entire state, only 23 students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in 2014–2015.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As there were no LEAs identified with significant disproportionality in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities, the USBE found it unnecessary to conduct an additional review of any LEA policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as per 34 CFR §300.170(b). The USBE did provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs to ensure accurate data collection and reporting of data and to address the procedural safeguards of the IDEA, as well as engaged in ongoing general supervision activities such as monitoring and dispute resolution.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

No actions required in FFY 2014.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

The State found it unnecessary to conduct a review of the identified LEAs policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as per 34 CFR §300.170(b), because no LEAs were identified with significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs. There was minimal identification of noncompliance in this area because no LEAs were flagged for having a significant discrepancy; thus, there was no required review.

The State makes continued efforts to conduct periodical reviews of suspension data submitted by each LEA. In addition to improvements of the data collection systems at both local and state levels, several SEA department meetings were conducted to discuss and plan for continued improvements to policies and practices related to disciplinary data collection.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
 - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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.
 - 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	16	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2014 State rate (based on the 2014–2015 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.03%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.03% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator for a suspension rate to be flagged.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As there were no LEAs identified with significant disproportionality in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities, the USBE found it unnecessary to conduct an additional review of any LEA policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as per 34 CFR §300.170(b). The USBE did provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs to ensure accurate data collection and reporting of data and to address the procedural safeguards of the IDEA, as well as engaged in ongoing general supervision activities such as monitoring and dispute resolution.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

No actions required in FFY 2014.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

The USBE found it unnecessary to conduct a review of the identified LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, Least Restrictive Behavioral Interventions Technical Assistance Manual (LRBI), and procedural safeguards, as per 34 CFR §300.170(b), because no LEAs were identified with significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs. There was minimal identification of noncompliance in this area because no LEAs were flagged for having a significant discrepancy; thus, there was no required review.

The USBE makes continued efforts to conduct periodical reviews of suspension data submitted by each LEA. In addition to improvements of the data collection systems at both local and state levels, several SEA department meetings were conducted to discuss and plan for continued improvements in both policies and practices related to disciplinary data collection.

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

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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			50.14%	51.15%	51.91%	52.88%	54.12%	55.53%	55.84%	56.81%	57.23%
		Data		48.68%	59.64%	51.40%	52.36%	53.58%	54.98%	55.29%	56.35%	56.81%	58.11%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.28%	15.66%	15.25%	15.18%	14.91%	14.06%	13.82%	13.57%	13.50%
		Data		14.72%	15.82%	15.40%	15.33%	15.06%	14.20%	13.96%	13.48%	13.57%	12.37%
C	2005	Target ≤			3.52%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	3.00%	3.00%
		Data		3.56%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	2.79%	2.59%	2.58%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	57.66%	58.09%	58.53%	58.97%
Target B ≤	13.43%	13.36%	13.29%	13.22%
Target C ≤	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data and targets, in consultation with the USBE SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administration Meeting (USEAM).

During FFY 2015, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

As Utah LEAs continue to increase the percent of students with disabilities receiving the majority of their services in general education settings through co-teaching and ongoing collaboration between general and special education teachers, support must also be increased for both students and teachers in these settings through the development of tiered instruction framework documents and professional development supporting the implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS).

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	69,925	null

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,268	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,949	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,564	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	33	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	145	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,268	69,925	58.11%	57.66%	60.45%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,949	69,925	12.37%	13.43%	11.37%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,742	69,925	2.58%	3.00%	2.49%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									36.41%	33.02%	33.22%
		Data								36.31%	40.58%	33.02%	32.37%
B	2011	Target ≤									41.26%	43.76%	43.56%
		Data								41.36%	38.01%	43.76%	44.71%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	33.42%	33.62%	33.82%	36.32%
Target B ≤	43.36%	43.16%	42.96%	41.35%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data, historical targets, and in consultation with the USBE SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel during a Utah State Special Education Administrator Meeting (USEAM). In addition, for Indicator 6, LEA preschool coordinators reviewed the proposed targets and provided input. Stakeholders agreed with the proposed targets from FFY 2013 through 2017, but due to the OSEP requirement that the 2018 target show improvement over baseline, the 2018 targets were adjusted to meet that requirement during FFY 2013.

In preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	10,007	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	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	3,539	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,909	null

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	189	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,539	10,007	32.37%	33.42%	35.37%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,098	10,007	44.71%	43.36%	40.95%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						95.09%	94.00%	94.05%	94.10%	90.52%	90.72%
		Data					95.09%	94.00%	94.80%	88.20%	88.51%	90.52%	87.95%
A2	2008	Target ≥						52.92%	52.74%	53.24%	53.74%	51.20%	51.40%
		Data					52.92%	52.73%	56.41%	47.60%	45.89%	51.20%	59.22%
B1	2008	Target ≥						93.20%	93.25%	93.30%	93.35%	89.96%	90.16%
		Data					93.20%	94.10%	94.50%	86.50%	87.95%	89.96%	87.17%
B2	2008	Target ≥						48.70%	49.20%	49.70%	50.20%	44.79%	44.99%
		Data					48.70%	51.84%	54.78%	43.70%	40.30%	44.79%	51.24%
C1	2008	Target ≥						93.91%	93.69%	93.74%	93.79%	90.70%	90.90%
		Data					93.91%	93.68%	94.35%	88.70%	88.42%	90.70%	90.51%
C2	2008	Target ≥						67.20%	67.70%	68.20%	68.70%	62.97%	63.17%
		Data					67.20%	67.97%	69.82%	61.90%	57.69%	62.97%	71.95%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	90.92%	91.12%	91.32%	95.10%
Target A2 ≥	51.60%	51.80%	52.00%	52.93%
Target B1 ≥	90.36%	90.56%	90.76%	93.21%
Target B2 ≥	45.19%	45.39%	45.59%	48.71%
Target C1 ≥	91.10%	91.30%	91.50%	93.92%
Target C2 ≥	63.37%	63.57%	63.77%	67.21%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after a data analysis and in consultation with the USBE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrator Meeting (USEAM). In addition, LEA preschool coordinators reviewed the proposed targets and provided input.

During FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3549.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	20.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	330.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1104.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1514.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	581.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2618.00	2968.00	87.95%	90.92%	88.21%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2095.00	3549.00	59.22%	51.60%	59.03%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	20.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	389.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1270.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1518.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	352.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2788.00	3197.00	87.17%	90.36%	87.21%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1870.00	3549.00	51.24%	45.19%	52.69%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	20.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	276.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	718.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1673.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	862.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2391.00	2687.00	90.51%	91.10%	88.98%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2535.00	3549.00	71.95%	63.37%	71.43%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

The slippage for C1 was minor. As part of the data analysis, LEAs with slippage were identified and professional development

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

opportunities were provided to ensure the data system and process are being used with fidelity and that students are provided with effective special education services. It is worth noting that information from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center shows that Utah data, compared to national data, is within average ranges for the past three years, with no large decreases and “within expected patterns.”

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			91.00%	83.64%	85.33%	87.42%	87.33%	89.63%	89.27%	86.04%	89.92%
Data		91.00%	84.00%	85.20%	87.30%	87.20%	89.50%	89.18%	89.83%	86.06%	86.04%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	79.52%	79.52%	79.62%	80.52%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

In FFY 2015, Utah gathered stakeholder feedback about the Utah parent survey and the utility of the results that LEAs and the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) staff receive from the survey. Utah stakeholders determined the Utah parent survey had questions that weren't adding value to the analysis of parent involvement in the special education process. The USBE Special Education Section (SES), in conjunction with representatives from the Utah Parent Center, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors, developed a new parent survey that targeted the specific areas that stakeholders felt were the most vital and useful questions when discriminating between schools that involved parents in a meaningful way in the special education process as means to improve services and results, and those schools which did not.

Therefore, the data reported above for FFY 2015 represents a new baseline of 79.52% respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The new targets were developed in consultation with the USBE SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the USEAP, and LEA Special Education Directors.

During FFY 2015, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at USEAP quarterly meetings. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE meetings and committee meetings and via emails and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review, not only for the development and implementation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the IDEA Partnership's *Collaboration Continuum* and *Leading by Convening* as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education. In addition, the USBE works in conjunction with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's OSEP-funded Parent Training Information Center) in collecting and analyzing data.

Stakeholder groups are very pleased with the new brief, but more focused, parent survey and feel that the proposed targets are appropriate, especially in consideration of national and Utah data trends. They proposed that the FFY 2016 target be the same as the baseline data as maintaining the high level of parent involvement in special education that the data demonstrates represents a reasonable, yet rigorous goal. As the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires, the FFY 2018 target demonstrates a statistically significant increase from the baseline data.

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1250.64	1572.78	86.04%	79.52%	79.52%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

A stratified, representative sample of preK–12 students was chosen within each surveyed LEA. Results were weighted according to population size of the LEA to ensure the overall state parent involvement percentage was an accurate reflection of the experience of parents of students with disabilities ages 3 to 21. Parents of students at all grade levels (and ages) responded to the survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The representativeness of the survey was assessed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the students whose parents responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all students with disabilities. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the grade level of the child; and (3) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 26% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a child with a speech/language impairment and 24% of students with disabilities in the entire sample have a speech/language impairment. Parents of students who are white were more likely to respond than parents of students who are non-white: 84% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a student who is white whereas 73% of the students with disabilities in the sample are white. Results were weighted by LEA to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Submitted collection tool: [Parent Survey](#)

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

For those LEAs that have more than 100 students, and thus for which 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 will receive four times the weight in computing overall state results).

Note: The number of respondents who reported that the school facilitated parent involvement and the total number of respondents aren't whole numbers because weighting data often results in fractional weights.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	146	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The USBE used FFY 2015 data for Indicator 9 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USBE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. Thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A “Final” Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group.

For Indicator 9, 146 LEAs are included in the analysis during 2015–2016. Of these 146 LEAs, 92 LEAs met the minimum “n” requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group). Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 142; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 146. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using 2014–2015 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use 2015–2016 data. Utah’s number of LEAs increases annually due to the increase in the number of public charter schools).

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Final Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above due to inappropriate identification. Once a ratio is flagged for suspected disproportionate representation, the policies, procedures, and practices of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the suspected disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

During FFY 2015, there were two LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of each of these two LEAs was conducted. These LEAs were required to submit documentation of their policies, procedures, and practices which were reviewed by the State to verify that there was no over-representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process, including student record reviews, evaluation, and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in these LEAs based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

N/A

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	146	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The USBE used FFY 2015 data for Indicator 10 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USBE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. Thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A “Final” Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group.

For Indicator 10, 146 LEAs were available for inclusion in the analysis. Of these 146 LEAs, 60 LEAs met the minimum “n” requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated. (For each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated—one for each of the seven racial/ethnic groups times the six primary disability categories). Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students with a particular disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 142; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 146. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using 2014–2015 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use 2015–2016 data. Utah’s number of LEAs increases annually due to the increase in the number of public charter schools).

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Final Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above as a result of inappropriate identification. Once a ratio is flagged for suspected disproportionate representation, the policies, procedures, and practices of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the suspected disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

During FFY 2015, there were six LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of each of these six LEAs was conducted. These LEAs were required to submit documentation of their policies, procedures, and practices which were reviewed by the State to verify that there was no over-representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process, including student record reviews, evaluation, and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in these LEAs based on this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		76.00%	95.20%	96.60%	96.90%	97.41%	94.58%	97.70%	98.88%	99.65%	99.47%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
277	275	99.47%	100%	99.28%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	2
---	---

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.

Of the 277 reviewed special education files, 275 students had eligibility determinations completed within the State-required timeline of 45 school days. Two students, both in the same LEA, had evaluations completed beyond that 45 school day timeline. The length of evaluations for those two students were within a range of five to eleven days overdue; each was due to teacher noncompliance.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

During the 2015–2016 school year, files of students aged 3–21 who received an initial evaluation were reviewed through on-site visits, Desk Audits, and the State dispute resolution process for this indicator (as part of the general supervision system). These files came from 38 LEAs (school districts, Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind, and charter schools).

The Utah State Board of Education, Special Education Services (USBE SES) has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements, including dispute resolution and general supervision responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities.

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system [Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS)] is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE staff review of each LEAs performance in a variety of pre-identified areas (e.g., timeliness of data and fiscal reports, their Program Improvement Plan and use of internal monitoring for compliance.) and indicators that cover both compliance with IDEA and USBE Special Education Rules and student outcomes/results. 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 (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, and Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities (including monitoring) for each LEA based on the LEAs level of identified need.

USBE SES's results-driven accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the state intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process. UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of USBE 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 USBE according to the LEAs performance in a variety

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis of episodic procedural monitoring to one of active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results.

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State (i.e., USBE) to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and USBE Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of overdue evaluation(s), Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), etc. LEAs whose program improvement plans do not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds.

Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices and the USBE SES verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE SES follows guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. This includes accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, including the correction of noncompliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, based upon the USBE SES's review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements.

Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.80%	93.10%	95.10%	98.60%	98.50%	99.60%	99.83%	99.36%	99.75%	99.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,509
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	434
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,968
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.	64
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	41

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,968	1,970	99.77%	100%	99.90%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	2
--	---

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

LEA 1—As a small, very rural school district, LEA 1 transitioned one student during the FFY 2015 year, making it difficult to remember when and how to enter information on only one student per year. The USBE has provided technical assistance to this LEA including traveling to the preschool site to ensure all staff understand the requirements of Indicator 12 and expect 100% compliance next school year.

LEA 2—A file folder was inadvertently misplaced with the family information needed to evaluate this one child in a timely manner. Out of 154 transitions done by this LEA, one transition was late, giving them a compliance rate of over 99%. The USBE has provided technical assistance to this LEA to ensure all staff understand the requirements of Indicator 12 and expect 100% compliance next school year.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Statewide database Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) has been fully operational since FFY 2009. TEDI accesses

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

the Part C Statewide database daily to obtain a list of all children that meet four criteria: child is 27 months old, has not opted out, is actively enrolled, and is considered potentially eligible for Part B. Each child's data are transferred to TEDI with the child's demographic information. As the Part C database transfers a child into TEDI, TEDI then accesses the USBE's Statewide Student Identifier System (SSID) to provide that child with a unique identification number that will continue with that child throughout his/her education in Utah. To ensure confidentiality, individual child-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 conference, the date of the child's third birthday, and whether the child was found eligible or not eligible. The Part C database and the Part B database (TEDI) provide data back and forth on a daily basis. Before a child's file can be closed out in Part C, the provider is required to reconcile data that has come from TEDI to ensure that the exit reason is accurately recorded for each child that has been referred to Part B.

TEDI provides the State and the school districts with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Part B. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. In the process of reviewing school district data on this indicator, the USBE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Noncompliance with timelines for Indicator 12 (34 CFR §300.124) is identified during an annual review of the TEDI statewide database by the State Monitoring Specialist and included with general supervision data.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The USBE verified that the four LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.124. In the process of determining that each LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, including accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of the noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.124, based upon the USBE's review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (i.e., Desk Audits).

In addition, three of the four LEAs requested professional development from the USBE specifically related to Indicator 12 and the USBE preschool coordinator provided that training.

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

The USBE ensured that all Part C to Part B evaluations/eligibility and IEP development/implementation timelines out of compliance in FFY 2014 were completed, although late (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In the review of additional data, a sample of files was reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with 34 CFR §300.124 (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). Each file was reviewed to ensure correct and timely evaluation, eligibility, IEP development, and implementation. As a result of these USBE and LEA actions (as described above), each LEA is in accordance with 34 CFR §300.124.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		78.00%	41.38%	78.64%		54.67%	58.00%	86.03%	87.72%	98.12%	99.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
311	334	99.75%	100%	93.11%

Explanation of Slippage

Slippage is related to a need to recruit and retain special educators trained in school to post-school transition, as well as a change in professional development delivery. FFY 2015 was the second year in which LEAs requested professional development of topics of their choosing, rather than having professional development assigned by the Utah State Board of Education, Special Education Services (USBE-SES) based on APR reports, student postschool outcomes, and other similar factors. During FFY 2015, only four "NARs" (Needs Assistance Requests) were submitted by LEAs requesting professional development; two NARs were submitted the previous year. Before implementation of the Utah Professional Development Network (UPDN), twenty-two targeted professional development activities related to transition were provided to LEAs by the USBE SES. The few NARs requested during those years may indicate that LEAs feel educators' knowledge of transition plan requirements is adequate; however, the slight slippage in state data demonstrates the ongoing need to prioritize this professional development.

At the time of this APR submission, 100% of files are in compliance with Indicator 13, and all findings of noncompliance have been corrected.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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 on this indicator were collected from 33 LEAs with secondary programs that were monitored through on-site Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) visits in 2015–2016 or were selected for Indicator 13 file reviews only. Trained USBE staff or contract monitors reviewed 334 files using the web-based compliance monitoring application. Of the 334 IEPs reviewed, 311 of the IEPs, or 93.11%, met the State requirements.

The review process that was part of UPIPS was developed to ensure that each LEA is included in the formal monitoring process. The USBE SES has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements, including dispute resolution and general supervision responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA).

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system, 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 indicators that cover both compliance and student outcomes/results. 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 (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, and Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified need. USBE SES's results-driven accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the state intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process.

UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of USBE 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 USBE 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. While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis of episodic procedural monitoring to one of active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results.

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible and generally within one month of discovery. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In addition, LEAs are required to write a program improvement plan to address their process for ensuring that the regulatory requirements are being implemented correctly throughout the LEA. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of the transition plan. LEAs whose program improvement plans do not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE-SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds. Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices, and the USBE verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction.

In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE SES follows guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. This includes accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, including the correction of noncompliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, based upon the USBE SES's review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%. Data indicate Utah continues efforts towards improvement in meeting the compliance requirements of Indicator 13 and will continue efforts to meet the target of 100%.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							27.60%	27.90%	28.60%	24.50%	25.25%
		Data						27.56%	33.10%	24.90%	27.60%	24.50%	20.82%
B	2009	Target ≥							54.30%	54.60%	55.30%	67.67%	70.67%
		Data						54.25%	68.10%	64.70%	66.30%	67.67%	65.35%
C	2009	Target ≥							71.80%	72.10%	72.80%	81.83%	84.83%
		Data						71.84%	80.60%	80.90%	81.01%	81.83%	79.72%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	26.00%	27.50%	28.25%	29.00%
Target B ≥	72.67%	75.67%	78.67%	81.67%
Target C ≥	87.83%	90.83%	93.83%	96.83%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data from previous years were analyzed to determine patterns of improvement or slippage over time in each target area. Based on this analysis, the focus for improvement will be in the following priority: decrease in numbers of youth who are unengaged or underengaged by increasing the number of youth completing at least one term of postsecondary education and increasing the number of youth meeting all requirements of competitive employment.

Targets were developed in consultation with the USBE SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrator Meeting (USEAM) meeting.

During FFY 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and Institute of Higher Education (IHE) personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USBE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the PTA in an effort to broaden the input. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2015.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1261.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	244.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	571.00
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)	83.00
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).	104.00

	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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
--	----------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	244.00	1261.00	20.82%	26.00%	19.35%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	815.00	1261.00	65.35%	72.67%	64.63%
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)	1002.00	1261.00	79.72%	87.83%	79.46%

Explanation of A Slippage

Anecdotal data indicate the following potential reasons for the continued slippage in the number of respondent youth who report completing a term or semester in higher education:

- IEP teams may feel that a transition program has been successful if a student with a disability is engaged in paid employment upon exiting school, as demonstrated by Vocational Rehabilitation being more visible in schools than any other adult services agency and the steady increase in the rate of engagement in competitive employment;
- IEP teams, including parents, may not hold high expectations for college attendance and success for students with disabilities;
- School counselors may not be working with students with disabilities to prepare Student Occupation Education Plans/College and Career Readiness Plans and thereby not making information about colleges and college financial aid available to this population;
- Some Utah colleges and universities have created more stringent admission requirements, including participation in the ACCUPLACER test prior to student placement in English and mathematics classes; and
- The increase in the Utah's college-age population has resulted in more competition for limited college admission slots.

To address these perceptions, the USBE is collaborating with the Utah System of Higher Education Program's Step Up to Higher Education activities, including the College Application Week program. This program was piloted in 2013 in eight high schools, and expanded to eighty-three high schools in 2015. By making opportunities available for financial and practical assistance in completing college applications, it is hoped the number of students applying to college, and ultimately enrolling and completing one term, will increase.

The USBE, during summer 2016, solicited stakeholder input on USBE Special Education Rules. The modifications included the following language:

"Students with disabilities must have access to school counselors for the purpose of planning and must be actively invited and included (when appropriate) in school activities which address course planning (including online courses), graduation, and post-secondary education and employment (i.e., college week, scholarship opportunities, ACT, and concurrent enrollment)."

The changes were adopted and became effective October 7, 2016.

Students with disabilities are engaged in other educational pursuits at a higher rate than FFY 2014, by completing high school (generally through adult education programs), participating in short-term employment training programs, and attending vocational training programs. Data also indicate a small, but steady, increase in the number of youth enlisting in the military in the year after exiting the school system.

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Utah reported less than 10 for this APR reporting period.

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))

This indicator is not applicable.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. Utah reported less than 10 held for this APR reporting period.

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))

This indicator is not applicable.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥		9.32%	11.54%
Data	7.10%	8.70%	

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	13.76%	15.98%	18.20%

Key:

Description of Measure

For FFY2014, the target for Utah's SIMR was 9.32%. Utah's actual data was only 8.70%, which did not meet the target but which was an improvement of 1.60% over baseline. Utah is very pleased that so much progress was made during the Phase II year, as very few implementation activities occurred, and those that did were largely related to the improvement of expectation and beliefs. Utah expects to meet SIMR targets in future years.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Overview

Data Analysis

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Utah will increase the percentage of students with Speech/Language Impairment (SLI) or Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) in grades six through eight who are proficient on the SAGE mathematics assessment by 11.11% over a five-year period.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Description

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

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

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Evaluation

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

Selected: 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: Glenna Gallo

Title: Director of Special Education

Email: glenna.gallo@schools.utah.gov

Phone: 801-538-7546