

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

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

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE 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 (attached).

USOE-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 USOE 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 USOE 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.

The monitoring system has five major objectives:

1. Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities by linking LEA data, including APR data, to improvement efforts and general supervision.
2. Ensure compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules.
3. Connect LEA-level and school-level improvement efforts with IDEA requirements.
4. Support each school district and charter school in the process of Self-Assessment, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and program effectiveness.
5. Link program improvement activities with long-range, multi-year professional development planning.

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

- **Continuity.** 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 USOE'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 (TA).** 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 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 USOE-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 plans do not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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%.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to 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 (RDA) process, all LEAs are assigned to a Tier level which designates the type of supports they will receive (attached).

At the universal level, all LEAs can contact USOE-SES staff by phone or email to have specific questions answered and/or to find resources to address specific concerns. LEA Special Education Directors receive a monthly periodical, the Spedometer, with compliance updates, program improvement ideas, event announcements, and other technical assistance information. Similarly, the LEA Special Education Directors are invited to attend (in person or online) a quarterly meeting that provides opportunities for discussions. The quarterly meeting also gives LEA Special Education Directors the opportunity to ask questions, share ideas, and network.

At the targeted level, LEAs that have been identified to need extra support in a specific area (e.g., preschool services, school to post-school transition services, effective instruction, and compliance) are assigned a mentor who is contracted by the USOE-SES to provide assistance to LEA staff, including self-monitoring activities and accessing targeted professional development.

At the intensive level, LEAs that have been identified to need intensive support in a specific area or areas are assigned a coach who is contracted by the USOE-SES to help the LEA accomplish specific activities that will improve their programs, including participating in monitoring activities and accessing professional development.

Technical assistance providers are vetted by the USOE-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 technical assistance on teacher behavior and student outcomes.

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.

Utah special education-related professional development needs are addressed by the Utah Professional Development Network (UPDN). The UPDN consists of multiple components intentionally focused on positively impacting results in students with disabilities. The model (attached) and accompanying descriptions identify significant components of the UPDN framework. Irrespective of established results-

driven accountability and compliance priorities, this model incorporates the most essential professional development elements needed to strengthen teacher practice and subsequent student learning. Importantly, the UPDN model identifies the component parts, including the need for tiered LEA supports at universal, targeted, and intensive levels (described above). Priorities were developed by stakeholders, based upon a thorough data analysis, and all provided professional development (PD) is evidence-based. Beginning at the top of the model, a ten item summary description of how the model operates is offered.

Ten Item Model Summary

1. Using the Annual Performance Report (APR), data, and advice from the UPDN Advisory Board and stakeholders, the USOE-SES leadership set PD priorities. These priorities include school-to-post-school transition, effective instruction, and student engagement. All priorities directly impact college and career readiness and prepare students with disabilities for skilled and competitive employment, involvement in post-secondary education, and independence.
2. The UPDN Core Team, in collaboration with the USOE-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 Core Team member contacts the person requesting assistance to discuss LEA needs and directs the person requesting assistance to an approved provider.
5. Systematically-screened approved providers to whom persons or groups requesting assistance can be directed to include all groups are identified.
6. LEAs receive varying levels of support based on results and compliance data.
7. The coordinated system of PD/TA improves results for students with disabilities, as measured by outcome data.
8. Internal evaluation is continuously conducted for the quality, relevance, and fidelity of PD events.
9. External evaluation of the entire UPDN system is conducted annually to determine if the project is addressing identified goals.
10. Sustainable, positive developmental, academic, socially, and behaviorally competent outcomes for all students with disabilities that will result in attainment of the skills necessary to achieve successful post-school activities is the goal.

The system will result in fewer stakeholders, including LEAs, in need of higher intensity support. At all levels, the system provides continuous feedback to the USOE-SES leadership on the performance of the LEAs with regard to results for students with disabilities and adherence to compliance requirements.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

During FFY 2013, in preparation for the APR and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), requirements and indicators continued to be shared with Local Education Agency (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 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA), in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum, as well as Leading by Convening, as a strategy to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education (attached).

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 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 2012 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 2012 APR in 2014, 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 USOE's website (<http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/Quick-Links/Performance-Plan.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 USOE-SES prepares and publishes a summary of indicators that are required to be publicly reported for each LEA. The report is posted on the USOE website (<http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/Quick-Links/Performance-Plan.aspx>) and is made available for posting on LEA websites.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		73.40%	73.30%	85.70%	85.70%	83.00%	71.80%	71.80%
Data	73.20%	72.90%	71.10%	81.00%	81.00%	85.10%	58.60%	60.91%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	62.13%	68.71%	70.08%	71.48%	72.91%	74.37%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Utah's 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 current approved (10-09-14) Utah ESEA Flexibility Waiver 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.

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 the FFY 2013 target will require 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 2014 targets were based off of the FFY 2013 data of 67.36%.

Both documents were presented to stakeholders at State Board meetings and disseminated publicly for comment prior to finalization and approval.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,543	2615

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,775	4,022
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	67.36%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

Overwrite data included are the actual number of students in the cohort that started ninth grade in school year 2009–2010 and graduated in school year 2012–2013, minus students who transferred out of the public school system plus those who transferred into the public school system. This includes students who were enrolled in junior high schools or charter schools that did not meet EDFacts criteria for a "high school."

Explanation of Data Discrepancy

Please explain why the calculated total does not match the adjusted cohort graduation rate reported to the CSPR.

Utah reports graduation rates using the federal four-year cohort graduation calculation. For state-level reporting, all students in ninth grade are captured since students in ninth grade in Utah junior highs are included in the count. This count differs from the EDFacts count due to EDFacts reporting requirements: EDFacts does not consider charter or other schools (e.g., junior high schools) with ninth grade, but not a graduation year, as high schools for reporting purposes. As the state count captures these students, the state count will be higher than the EDFacts count.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
2,615	4,022	60.91%	62.13%	65.02%

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.

The FFY 2013 graduation rate of 65.02% is an increase of 6.77% over the FFY 2012 rate of 60.90%.

Starting in FFY 2012, the USOE applied a formula for the cohort graduation rate required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and specifically approved for use in Utah by the United States (U.S.) Department of Education. The graduation rate calculation is based on the number of students who enter ninth grade and graduate with their cohort. The calculation is:

Number of on-time graduates in the cohort

Number of ninth graders in the cohort minus the number of students who transferred out of the public

education system plus the number of students who transferred into 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 Alternate Assessment (UAA) due to the severity of their disabilities, and students who received a Utah High School Completion Diploma by passing the General Education Development (GED) test. Utah used the same data for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the ESEA.

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 Utah State Board of Education Administrative Rule R277-700; LEAs may require additional course credits beyond the State minimum. Students who meet the course credit requirements are awarded a regular high school diploma. Any student who does not meet all graduation requirements may, at the discretion of the LEA, be awarded a Certificate of Completion.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the 2012–2013 school year, 109 students with disabilities, aged 16 through 19, dropped out of school and enrolled in Utah adult education programs. Fifteen of these students earned Adult Education High School Diplomas and a small number of students (N<10) passed all sections of the GED exam and earned a Utah High School Completion Diploma.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

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: 2011

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	6.89%	6.79%	6.69%	6.59%	6.49%	6.39%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,460	21,188	7.70%	6.89%	6.89%

Use a different calculation methodology

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Utah is reporting dropout data using Option 2. This is the event, or single-year, dropout rate for students with disabilities.

A student who drops out is one who:

1. was enrolled in school at some time during the school year and was not enrolled on October 1 of the following school year, **OR**
2. was not enrolled on October 1 of the school year although was expected to be in membership (i.e., was not reported as a dropout the year before), **AND**
3. has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program, **AND**
4. did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - a. transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program;
 - b. temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness; or
 - c. death.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the 2012–13 school year, 109 students with disabilities, aged 16 through 19, dropped out of school and enrolled in Utah adult education programs. Fifteen of these students earned Adult Education High School Diplomas and four students passed all sections of the GED exam and earned a Utah High School Completion Diploma.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

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

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed in alignment with Utah's ESEA waiver, consultation with the USOE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors.

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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO? AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
132					

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2013	Target ≥		95.00%	97.00%	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%
Math	A Overall	2013	Target ≥		95.00%	98.00%	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%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Utah consistently has high participation rates; however, with the new 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 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 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 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	41,864	40,611	99.56%	95.00%	97.01%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	39,297	37,994	99.70%	95.00%	96.68%

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Utah's webiste is currently going through revisions, so the website information may need to be updated during the clarification period.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A 3-8	2013	Target ≥				83.00%	83.00%	83.00%		62.00%
			Data				48.19%	48.96%	51.00%	52.08%	51.61%
	B 10-12	2013	Target ≥				82.00%	82.00%	82.00%		63.16%
			Data				45.58%	50.63%	53.58%	54.39%	52.65%
Math	A 3-8	2013	Target ≥				45.00%	45.00%	45.00%		58.39%
			Data				42.05%	45.95%	46.43%	45.79%	47.11%
	B 10-12	2013	Target ≥					40.00%	40.00%		42.38%
			Data				40.00%	37.53%	25.67%	26.05%	22.96%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ 3-8	16.70%	25.03%	33.36%	41.69%	50.02%	58.35%
	B ≥ 10-12	12.82%	21.54%	30.26%	38.97%	47.69%	56.41%
Math	A ≥ 3-8	19.52%	27.57%	35.62%	43.66%	51.71%	59.76%
	B ≥ 10-12	0.55%	10.50%	20.44%	30.39%	40.33%	50.28%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 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 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A 3-8	36,809	6,147	51.61%	16.70%	16.70%
B 10-12	3,784	485	52.65%	12.82%	12.82%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A 3-8	36,896	7,203	47.11%	19.52%	19.52%
B 10-12	1,085	6	22.96%	0.55%	0.55%

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Utah's website is going through revision, and this link may need to be updated during the clarification period.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		3.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	4.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2013 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

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	126	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 USOE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2013 State rate (based on the 2012–2013 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.14%. The USOE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.14% 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 25 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and also suspended any students with disabilities in 2012–2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

N/A, there were no findings of noncompliance.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

As there were no LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs, the State 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). However, the USOE did provide ongoing professional development to LEA administrators, data staff, and special education directors to ensure accurate collection and reporting of data, as well as to address procedural safeguards of the IDEA, as well as engaged in ongoing general supervision monitoring.

- 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:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 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 in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	126	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USOE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2013 State rate (based on the 2012–2013 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.14%. The USOE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.14% 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 for it to be flagged. Only 25 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and also suspended any students with disabilities in 2012/2013.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

N/A, there were no findings of noncompliance.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

As there were no LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs, the State 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). However, the USOE did continue to provide professional development to LEA staff in those areas, to proactively address student needs and engaged in ongoing general supervision monitoring.

- 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).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		50.14%	51.15%	51.91%	52.88%	54.12%	55.53%	55.84%
		Data	48.68%	59.64%	51.40%	52.36%	53.58%	54.98%	55.29%	56.35%
B	2005	Target ≤		14.28%	15.66%	15.25%	15.18%	14.91%	14.06%	13.82%
		Data	14.72%	15.82%	15.40%	15.33%	15.06%	14.20%	13.96%	13.48%
C	2005	Target ≤		3.52%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%
		Data	3.56%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	2.79%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	56.81%	57.23%	57.66%	58.09%	58.53%	58.97%
Target B ≤	13.57%	13.50%	13.43%	13.36%	13.29%	13.22%
Target C ≤	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data and targets, in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE 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, 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).

It is important to continue serving students in the least restrictive environment (LRE) while meeting their needs and providing a full continuum of services, as needed. With this in mind, as well as comparing Utah against the national average and seven states with similar demographics, and taking into account the progress that Utah has made over the past nine years, Utah proposes to increase the number of students with disabilities age six through 21 inside the regular classroom 80% or more of the day by 0.75% per school year for each of the next five years (FFY 2013 actual = 56.81%; FFY 2014 target = 56.81% + (56.81*0.75%) = 57.23%).

Progress has also been made in decreasing the percentage of students with disabilities served inside the regular classroom less than 40% of the day, and Utah proposes to continue this progress by decreasing the amount of time by 0.50% per year for each of the next five years (FFY 2013 actual = 13.57%; FFY 2014 target = 13.57% - (13.57*0.50%) = 13.50%).

The percentage of students with disabilities aged 6 through 21 placed in separate schools, residential placements or receiving home instruction has decreased significantly over the past nine years from 3.47% to 2.59%. While this decrease is exciting, Utah has only been below 3% for the past two years, and recognizes the need to ensure a continuum of placements for students who are in need of these more restrictive types of settings. Therefore, Utah proposes to maintain a 3% average or below target for Indicator 5C for the next five years, which is lower than original baseline data of 3.56%.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	65,912	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	37,442	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,944	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,531	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	36	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	138	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the	37,442	65,912	56.35%	56.81%	56.81%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
day					
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,944	65,912	13.48%	13.57%	13.57%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,705	65,912	2.79%	3.00%	2.59%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								36.41%
		Data							36.31%	40.58%
B	2011	Target ≤								41.26%
		Data							41.36%	38.01%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	33.02%	33.22%	33.42%	33.62%	33.82%	36.32%
Target B ≤	43.76%	43.56%	43.36%	43.16%	42.96%	41.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data (including FFY 2013), historical targets, and in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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, 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. 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

Prepopulated Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	9,516	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	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	3,142	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,985	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	179	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,142	9,516	40.58%	33.02%	33.02%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,164	9,516	38.01%	43.76%	43.76%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					95.09%	94.00%	94.05%	94.10%
		Data				95.09%	94.00%	94.80%	88.20%	88.51%
A2	2008	Target ≥					52.92%	52.74%	53.24%	53.74%
		Data				52.92%	52.73%	56.41%	47.60%	45.89%
B1	2008	Target ≥					93.20%	93.25%	93.30%	93.35%
		Data				93.20%	94.10%	94.50%	86.50%	87.95%
B2	2008	Target ≥					48.70%	49.20%	49.70%	50.20%
		Data				48.70%	51.84%	54.78%	43.70%	40.30%
C1	2008	Target ≥					93.91%	93.69%	93.74%	93.79%
		Data				93.91%	93.68%	94.35%	88.70%	88.42%
C2	2008	Target ≥					67.20%	67.70%	68.20%	68.70%
		Data				67.20%	67.97%	69.82%	61.90%	57.69%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	90.52%	90.72%	90.92%	91.12%	91.32%	95.10%
Target A2 ≥	51.20%	51.40%	51.60%	51.80%	52.00%	52.93%
Target B1 ≥	89.96%	90.16%	90.36%	90.56%	90.76%	93.21%
Target B2 ≥	44.79%	44.99%	45.19%	45.39%	45.59%	48.71%
Target C1 ≥	90.70%	90.90%	91.10%	91.30%	91.50%	93.92%
Target C2 ≥	62.97%	63.17%	63.37%	63.57%	63.77%	67.21%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after a data analysis and in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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, 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

However, as stated in Utah's FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 APRs, "it is Utah's intention to set a new baseline in FFY 2014 when current preschool students will have exited" as Utah intends implement a new statewide measurement tool/system for Indicator 7 during FFY 2014. Utah will then establish a new Indicator 7 baseline and go through the target setting process.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3,170
--	-------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	21
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	248
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,278
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,290
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	333

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,568	2,837	88.51%	90.52%	90.52%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,623	3,170	45.89%	51.20%	51.20%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	280
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,455
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,189
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	231

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013
--	-----------	-------------	----------	----------	----------

			Data*	Target*	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)	2,644	2,939	87.95%	89.96%	89.96%
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)	1,420	3,170	40.30%	44.79%	44.79%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	19
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	225
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	930
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,449
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	547

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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)	2,379	2,623	88.42%	90.70%	90.70%
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)	1,996	3,170	57.69%	62.97%	62.97%

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USOE obtains complete data on all preschool students (as verified by school districts), and has provided detailed professional development to LEAs on how to combine data from multiple sources to ensure accurate ratings on the Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) Summary form. USOE-SES continues to work with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center) and their Communities of Practice to identify additional methods to analyze and ensure the reliability of data. Policies and procedures to guide measurement practices include:

- School districts report entry and exit data annually, by June 30th, to the USOE. Data are collected, summarized, and reported annually.
- The UPOD Student Summary form is a State-wide form that is used by each school district to determine student ratings and document data sources and team members. The UPOD Student Summary form is kept in a student’s file until the child exits the preschool program [While the form has been renamed for use in Utah, the process and definitions are the same as developed by the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Center—which has become the ECTA Center].

- School districts submitted a list of data sources that may be used to collect and report data to the USOE.
- The special education team working with the student determined student ratings on each UPOD outcome using the rubric developed and defined by the ECO Center.
- Since there are seven points on the UPOD rating scale, data are translated using the ECO Decision Tree and ECO calculator to reflect the five OSEP categories.
- Scores of six and seven on the UPOD (ECO-COSF) scale define typical or comparable to same-age peers.
- There are two points of data collection. Data collection periods occur within six weeks of eligibility and when the student exits the preschool special education program.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Utah reported both the required progress data and target data.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		91.00%	83.64%	85.33%	87.42%	87.33%	89.63%	89.27%
Data	91.00%	84.00%	85.20%	87.30%	87.20%	89.50%	89.18%	89.83%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	86.04%	86.14%	86.24%	86.34%	86.44%	91.01%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education. In addition, the USOE works in conjunction with the OSEP-funded parent center in collecting and analyzing data.

Although the proposed targets are lower than some years of Utah's actual data, the stakeholder groups felt that the targets were appropriate, especially in consideration of national and Utah data trends. However, to comply with the OSEP requirement of final targets exceeding baseline data, the FFY 2018 target has been modified to 91.01%.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
994	1,155	89.83%	86.04%	86.06%

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.

The USOE employed a sampling methodology as approved by OSEP in December 2007 to gather data for this indicator. The sampling methodology is based on the monitoring cycle. Data on this indicator were collected from those LEAs in year two of the monitoring cycle during 2012–2013, plus the four LEAs that have an enrollment of more than 50,000 students. A stratified random sample of LEAs is included in each year of the monitoring cycle. In assigning LEAs to the monitoring cycle, LEAs were stratified by size, percent special education, percent free/reduced lunch, percent non-white and geographical location. LEAs were then randomly assigned to one of the five years within the monitoring cycle.

Parents, both contacted and those who responded, included parents of preschool-aged children as well as parents of K–12+ students. Thus, the parent involvement percentage score includes parents of students with disabilities ages 3–21.

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

Administration of the Questionnaire: The USOE mailed letters explaining the purpose of the survey and blank questionnaires to parents of selected students. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included with each questionnaire to facilitate the return of the completed questionnaire. Each questionnaire was arbitrarily coded to uniquely identify the student. Parents whose preference was Spanish in communications with the LEA were sent a Spanish translation prepared by the USOE Educational Equity section. In addition, a Spanish-speaking representative was available by telephone for parent questions.

Data Coding: Two designated representatives at the USOE were trained and assigned to receive the returned questionnaires. A database was created in Microsoft Excel to record each response. A code was used to input “yes”, “no”, and “no response” responses for each unique student for whom a completed questionnaire was received. Handwritten comments were compiled for additional information for USOE use. By using both representatives to input and cross-check data, data coding accuracy was ensured.

Statistical Analysis: Responses were weighted to represent the entire population, and the percentage answering “yes” to each item for each category of interest was calculated with a technique similar to multiple regression with dummy variables (Multiple Classification Analysis-MCA) to control the potentially confounding effects of all other categories in the analysis.

Survey Instrument: A questionnaire called the “Parent Survey” was developed based upon a review of over 10 surveys currently used in surrounding States and by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The newly developed survey incorporated many important elements from those surveys and consists of 37 questions. The resultant survey is a manageable document for parents. It uses a dichotomous scale (yes or no) rather than a Likert scale, because the questions focus on whether or not particular events occurred. The draft survey was subjected to an informal validation procedure. A small sample of parents, parent advocates, special education personnel, and school administrators responded to the survey, and the draft was revised into its final form based on their feedback. The parent survey will provide data for this indicator, and will also serve as an additional data source regarding parental input and participation for the State’s monitoring process.

Because of the unique conformation of Utah's 41 school districts, there are four school districts of 50,000+ students. However, these four large school districts will be sampled each year for this indicator. Each of the five cohorts also includes school districts of medium and small size as well as charter schools. Based upon analysis of data from the five cohorts in the UPIPS monitoring process, the cohorts are comparably representative of the State population in total student enrollment, poverty, prevalence of students with disabilities, and on an urban-rural continuum.

As a result of the FFY 2013 results, parents will be asked to examine the survey and offer suggestions for improvement. An effort will be made to obtain more responses from Hispanic parents. A meeting was held with a Hispanic consultant at the Utah Parent Center. Several suggestions were made to solicit a higher response rate:

1. The survey will be introduced and explained at Utah Parent Center IEP trainings.
2. When possible, small groups of parents will be asked to look at the survey and offer feedback about how to improve it.
3. Once the survey has been sent out, Spanish speaking parent volunteers will make phone calls to explain the survey's purpose and to answer questions.

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? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



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

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

Parents of students within each of these selected LEAs were sampled. The sampling was completed at the LEA level. A sample of students with disabilities was randomly selected from each of the selected LEAs. The number of students chosen was dependent on the number of total students with disabilities in an LEA. The sample sizes selected ensured roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes. For those LEAs in which a sample was chosen, the population was stratified by gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and grade level to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample. When calculating the State-level results, responses were weighted by the students with disabilities' population size (e.g., an LEA that has four times the number of students with disabilities as another LEA will receive four times the weight in computing overall State results).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Utah is investigating possible changes to the sampling plan going forward and will be resubmitting a new sampling plan to OSEP.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
2	0	132	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 USOE used FFY 2013 data for Indicator 9 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USOE 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.

Prior to FFY 2008, if there were at least 10 students with disabilities in the group of interest but fewer than 10 students with disabilities in the comparison group, then an Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) was used. The ARR served to compare the LEA's identification rates with the identification rates of the State as a whole. However, there are LEAs that have unique situations, particularly the smaller LEAs where the ARR was most typically used, and thus, many of the flagged ARR's were not a reflection of any inappropriate identification practices

occurring, but rather a reflection of small numbers of students with disabilities in various racial/ethnic groups in these small LEAs (This conclusion was reached after two years of using the ARR and investigating all ratios above 3.00). Therefore, beginning with FFY 2008, the ARR is no longer being used for Indicator 9.

For Indicator 9, 132 LEAs are included in the analysis during 2013–2014. Of these 132 LEAs, 76 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 126; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 132. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using 2012–2013 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use 2013-2014 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 2013, there were two LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00; however, no disproportionate representation was found to be occurring LEA based upon the subsequent USOE-SES review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

N/A, as there were no findings of noncompliance to be corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	0	132	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 USOE used FFY 2013 data for Indicator 10 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USOE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories 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.

Previous to FFY 2008, if there were at least 10 students with disabilities in the group of interest but fewer than 10 students with disabilities in the comparison group, then an Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) was used. The ARR served to compare the LEAs identification rates with the identification rates of the State as a whole. However, there are LEAs that have unique situations, particularly the smaller LEAs where the ARR was most typically used, and thus, many of the flagged ARR were not a reflection of any inappropriate identification practices occurring, but rather a reflection of small numbers of students in various racial/ethnic groups in

these small LEAs (this conclusion was reached after two years of using the ARR and investigating all ratios above 3.00). Therefore, beginning with FFY 2008, the ARR was no longer used for Indicator 10.

For Indicator 10, 132 LEAs were available for inclusion in the analysis. Of these 132 LEAs, 55 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 126; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 132. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using 2012–2013 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use 2013-2014 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.

A careful review of each of the seven LEAs that were at or above the cut-score of 3.00 for over-representation was conducted. Those 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. It was determined based on the data review process that none of the flagged LEAs had disproportionate representation based on inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

N/A, as there were no findings of noncompliance to be corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	76.00%	95.20%	96.60%	96.90%	97.41%	94.58%	97.70%	98.88%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
574	572	98.88%	100%	99.65%

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 574 reviewed files, 572 students had eligibility determinations which were completed within the State-required timeline of 45 school days. Two students, one student in each of two LEAs, had evaluations completed beyond that 45 school day timeline. The lengths of evaluations for these two students were 55 and 185 school days (a range of 10 to 140 school days overdue). Delays in both of the evaluations were due to special education personnel noncompliance. Delays that were due to the following were not included in these totals:

- 1) a parent repeatedly failing or refusing to produce the student for the evaluation, or
- 2) students who were enrolled in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluation had begun, and prior to a determination by the student's previous public agency as to whether the student is a student with a disability (34 CFR §300.301).

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 2013–2014 school year, files of students aged 3–21 who received an initial evaluation were reviewed through on-site visits, Self-Assessment reports, Desk Audits, and the State dispute resolution process for this indicator as part of the general supervision system. These files came from 40 LEAs (school districts and charter schools).

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE 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 (attached).

USOE-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 USOE 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 USOE 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.

The monitoring system has five major objectives:

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

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

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

Continuity. 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 USOE's and the LEAs 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 (TA). 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 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 USOE-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), Individual 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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

N/A, required actions are addressed on the next page, under correction of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The USOE verified that the six LEAs with findings of noncompliance are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.301. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USOE 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 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 §300.301, including completing initial evaluations within the State-required timelines of 45 school

days (and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance), based upon the USOE's review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits).

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

The USOE ensured that all initial evaluations found to be noncompliant in FFY 2012 were completed, though late, and eligibility determined for the students (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 §300.301 (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). Each file was reviewed to ensure correct and timely initial evaluation determination. As a result of these USOE and LEA actions (as described above), each LEA is in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301, including completing initial evaluations within the State-required timelines of 45 school days.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.80%	93.10%	95.10%	98.60%	98.50%	99.60%	99.83%	99.36%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,955
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	290
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,599
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.	48
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	14

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,599	1,603	99.36%	100%	99.75%

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	4
--	---

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.

See attached.

Attached PDF table (optional) [Indicator 12 table](#)

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) was fully operational in FFY 2009. TEDI accesses 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 USOE’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, 2013 through June 30, 2014. In the process of reviewing school district data on this indicator, the USOE 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 database by the State Monitoring Specialist and included with general supervision data.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

N/A, as the only required actions are addressed in the next section, as correction of findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The USOE verified that the LEAs with findings of noncompliance are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.124. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USOE 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 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 USOE's review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits).

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

The USOE ensured that all Part C to Part B evaluations/eligibility found to be noncompliant in FFY 2012 were completed, though late, and eligibility determined for the students (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 initial evaluation determination. As a result of these USOE and LEA actions (as described above), each LEA is in accordance with 34 CFR §300.124.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	78.00%	41.38%	78.64%		54.67%	58.00%	86.03%	87.72%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
209	213	87.72%	100%	98.12%

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 16 LEAs with secondary programs that were monitored through on-site Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) visits in 2013–2014. Trained USOE staff or contract monitors reviewed 218 files using the web-based compliance monitoring application. Of the 213 IEPs reviewed, 209 of the IEPs, or 98.12%, 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 Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-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 USOE-SES continuous improvement monitoring system, UPIPS, is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USOE 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 (attached).

USOE-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 USOE 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 USOE 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.

The monitoring system has five major objectives:

1. Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities by linking LEA data, including APR data, to improvement efforts and general supervision.
2. Ensure compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules.
3. Connect LEA-level and school-level improvement efforts with IDEA requirements.
4. Support each school district and charter school in the process of Self-Assessment, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and program effectiveness.
5. Link program improvement activities with long-range, multi-year professional development planning.

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

Continuity. 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 USOE'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 (TA). 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 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 USOE-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), Individual 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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 USOE-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 to make significant improvement in meeting the compliance requirements of Indicator 13 and will continue efforts to meet the target of 100%.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

N/A, as required actions are addressed in the next section under correction of findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
139	139	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

All findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 related to regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320, including having IEPs with complete transition services plans, were corrected. The USOE verified that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320. In the process of determining that the LEAs corrected noncompliance for this indicator, the USOE 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 noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA findings of noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320, including completing transition plans that meet Indicator 13 requirements, based upon the USOE’s review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). Additionally, the USOE ensured that existing transition plans that were not in compliance in FFY 2011 were completed accurately for the students in question (Prong 1 of the OSEP 0902 Memorandum).

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

A sample of files was subsequently reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with 34 CFR §300.320 (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). As a result of these USOE and LEA actions (as described above), each LEA is in accordance with 34 CFR §300.320. In the event that noncompliance is not corrected in a timely manner, the following enforcement actions will occur (actions will be selected to target the reason behind the continuing noncompliance): required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						27.60%	27.90%	28.60%
		Data					27.56%	33.10%	24.90%	27.60%
B	2009	Target ≥						54.30%	54.60%	55.30%
		Data					54.25%	68.10%	64.70%	66.30%
C	2009	Target ≥						71.80%	72.10%	72.80%
		Data					71.84%	80.60%	80.90%	81.01%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.50%	25.25%	26.00%	27.50%	28.25%	29.00%
Target B ≥	67.67%	70.67%	72.67%	75.67%	78.67%	81.67%
Target C ≥	81.83%	84.83%	87.83%	90.83%	93.83%	96.83%

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 USOE-SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and 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 USOE Teaching and Learning section, as well as the Utah Education Association (UEA) and PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration

Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2013 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	1,200
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	294
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	518
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)	68
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).	102

	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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	294	1,200	27.60%	24.50%	24.50%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	812	1,200	66.30%	67.67%	67.67%
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)	982	1,200	81.01%	81.83%	81.83%

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

See attachment "Valid and Reliable Data."

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		75.00%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	100%	85.71%	25.00%	50.00%	100%	100%	75.00%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data are reviewed annually with stakeholders, who agree that there is no need to identify targets or improvement activities at this time, due to the low N size.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	0%		

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

N/A

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	87.50%	66.67%	33.33%	88.88%	100%	83.33%	33.33%	80.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data are reviewed annually with stakeholders, who agree that there is no need to identify targets or improvement activities at this time, due to the low N size.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	3	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1	2	3	80.00%		100%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

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.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target					

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

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.

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

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Description

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.

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)

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.