UT
Part B

FFY2016
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

In FFY 2016, Utah either met or was in significant compliance with 15 of 30 possible targets on the applicable Part B APR indicators. These included indicators measuring dropout, discipline, LRE (ages 6-21), preschool outcomes statement 2 (i.e., functioning within age expectations), disproportionality, and compliance indicators 11 and 12. Academic proficiency for the general education population in Utah decreased in FFY 2016 and the same trend was seen for students with disabilities. Utah again missed three indicators measuring preschool outcomes Summary Statement 1. Although those targets were missed, Utah continues to demonstrate high levels of preschool achievement in comparison nationally, ranging between 87%-89%. Additionally, continued implementation of a state law allowing parents to refuse participation in a statewide assessment resulted in a continued decrease in the participation rates of students with disabilities. Indicator 13 shows a slight decline from FFY 2015 and will continue to be an area of priority in the state. Through a continuous improvement process, the USBE SES identified that the data reported for Indicator 13 in FFY 2015 was slightly inaccurate, (93.11% compliance was reported but the actual compliance was 92.41%). Progress was made on all three indicators of Post-School Outcomes, though the targets for Indicator 14 were not met.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

150

General Supervision System:

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

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

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system is called the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) and is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE staff review of each Local Education Agency's (LEA's) performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier which includes a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified need.

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

UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of SEA support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the state education agency (USBE SES) 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:

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

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

- An effective accountability system is continuous rather than episodic, is linked to systemic change, and integrates self-assessment with continuous feedback and response.

- Partnership with stakeholders**.** The LEA works in partnership with diverse stakeholders. This collaboration affects the following areas: the collection and analysis of self-assessment data; the identification of critical issues and solutions to problems; and the development, implementation, and oversight of improvement strategies to ensure compliance and improved results for students with disabilities.
- LEA accountability. LEAs are accountable for identifying strengths and areas of concern based upon data analysis; identifying, implementing and revising strategies for program improvement; and submitting annual measurement and progress reports.
- Self-Assessment. Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a Self-Assessment process that focuses on improving results for students with disabilities.
- Data-driven process. The improvement process in each LEA is driven by data that focuses on improved results for students with disabilities. Each LEA collects and uses data on an ongoing basis, aligned with both the USBE's and the LEA's performance goals and indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the Self-Assessment process include APR indicators, personnel needs, graduation and dropout rates, performance of students with disabilities on state- and district-wide assessments, rates at which students with disabilities are suspended and/or expelled from school, and rates of identification and placement of students from minority backgrounds.
- Technical assistance. The focus of the monitoring process is on continuous improvement; therefore technical assistance is a critical component of the process. Key components of technical assistance are the identification and dissemination of evidenced-based practices and promising practices as well as 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 USBE SER are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 process, all LEAs are assigned to a Tier level which designates the type of supports they will receive.

Supporting Tier

LEAs in the Supporting Tier demonstrate successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations and USBE SER,

acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional development resources. LEA-specific areas of need/improvement are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) developed by the LEA. A progress report on the PIP is submitted to the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is supported by the USBE SES for LEAs in this tier.

Guiding Tier

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

Assisting Tier

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

Coaching Tier

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

Directing Tier

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

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

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

Nine Item Model Summary

1. Using the APR, data, and advice from the UPDN Advisory Board and stakeholders, the USBE SES leadership set PD priorities. These priorities include school-to-post-school transition, effective instruction, student engagement in mathematics and reading/English language arts and behavior. (Behavior was added by the UPDN Advisory Board in the spring of 2017.) All priorities directly impact college and career readiness and prepare students with disabilities for skilled and competitive employment, involvement in post-secondary education, and independent living.
2. The UPDN Core Team, in collaboration with the USBE SES, organizes priority-driven PD for all LEAs, recognizing that all LEAs receive universal-level PD.
3. LEAs request UPDN support associated with identified PD priorities or needs specific to their respective LEA using the "single point

of entry" internet-based request system. They click on a "need assistance" button and fill out a brief form, including contact information.

4. Within 48 hours, a UPDN team member contacts the person requesting assistance to discuss their LEAs respective needs and directs the person requesting assistance to an approved provider.
5. The UPDN system screens "approved providers" that can plan, deliver and evaluate PD to LEA staff upon request.
6. LEAs receive differentiated levels of support based on results and compliance data as well as by LEA request.
7. The coordinated system of PD improves results for students with disabilities, as measured by outcome data.
8. Internal evaluation is systematically conducted, assessing the quality, relevance, and fidelity of PD events.
9. The entire UPDN system is externally evaluated annually to determine if the project is addressing identified goals.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

During FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), requirements and indicators continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. Changes and updates in OSEP and USBE SER requirements were articulated during these meetings. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum, as well as Leading by Convening, as a strategy to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

Each February, the State reports to the public on its progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The APR is posted on the USBE's website (https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/datareporting?mid=936&tid=2). The final APR is shared at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the USBE and USEAP, and with the LEA Special Education Directors after submission. Results are also shared with the Utah Parent Center, Utah's Parent Training and Information Center. Prior to April 15 of each year (within 120 days of the State's submission of its APR), the USBE SES prepares and publishes a summary of indicators that are required to be publicly reported for each LEA. The report is posted on the USBE website (https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/datareporting?mid=936&tid=2) and is made available for posting on LEA websites.

The results of the FFY 2016 APR will be reported to the Utah State Board of Education in the March 2018 Board meeting.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	69.59%
Data	67.93%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

Both documents were presented to stakeholders at State Board meetings and disseminated publicly for comment prior to finalization and approval. As the new Utah ESSA Plan is completed in 2018, stakeholder input and public meetings will continue to be held, to ensure stakeholder engagement throughout the process.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,068	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,369	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.22%	Calculate

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
3,068	4,369	67.93%	71.48%	70.22%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

USBE Rule R277-705-5 addresses graduation requirements for students with disabilities.

A. A student with disabilities served by special education programs shall satisfy high school completion or graduation criteria, consistent with state and federal law and the student's IEP.

R277-705-5(1) requires students with disabilities served by special education programs to satisfy high school completion or graduation requirements, consistent with state and federal law and the students' IEPs. The USBE Special Education Rules (SER) VII.C.2 allows the IEP team to amend graduation requirements and require that any amendments must be documented in the IEP. Amendments may include modifications, substitutions, and/or exemptions made to accommodate the needs of the individual student. R277-700.6(22) allows graduation requirements modifications to meet the unique educational needs of a student if: (i) the student has a disability; and (ii) the modifications to the student's graduation requirements are made through the student's individual IEP. The rule requires that the LEA document the nature and extent of the modification, substitution, or exemption made to a student's graduation requirements in the student's IEP. R277-700.6(24) offers further guidance regarding substitutions in graduation requirements: An LEA may modify graduation requirements for an individual student to achieve an appropriate route to student success if the modification: (a) is consistent with: (i) the student's IEP; or (ii) SEOP/Plan for College and Career Readiness; (b) is maintained in the student's file; (c) includes the parent's signature; and (d) maintains the integrity and rigor expected for high school graduation, as determined by the Board.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah's annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance. Utah received TA from National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) on Indicators 13 & 14 during Utah's annual Transition Institutes from June Gothberg (2014-2018). There were 45 LEAs who participated in Utah's Transition Institute in 2017 and 57 LEAs who participated in 2018. Utah is also participating in quarterly NTACT Rural states webinar training. The Transition Specialist is receiving ongoing technical assitance from June Gothberg at NTACT.

The USBE Transition Specialist attended the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in 2015, 2016, and 2017, including attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

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

FFY	2015
Target ≤	37.90%
Data	29.82%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

During FFY 2013 and 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- (●) Option 1
- ( ) Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,373	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	138	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	139	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,404	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	16	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,404	5,070	29.82%	36.00%	27.69%

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

The Indicator 2 dropout rate comes from the EDFacts 009 report data according to the EDFacts 009 specifications.

Definition of Single-Year Dropouts are students who left ninth through twelfth grade with a reason of Unknown, Withdrawn, Dropout, Expelled, Transferred to Adult Education, Exited to take the GED1, or Graduation Pending. Additionally, if the student finished the school year and was expected to return to school the next year, or transferred to another public school within the state (including district and charter schools) and did not reappear by September 30 of the following school year, then he/she counts as a dropout. Finally, if the student was a retained senior but did not reappear by September 30 of the following school year, then he/she counts as a dropout. This count does not include students who transferred to home school, private school, or a school outside of the state or country. Students who withdrew for medical reasons are also excluded from the dropout count. This definition is consistent with the federal definition of a Single-Year Dropout.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah's annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance. Utah received TA from National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) on Indicators 13 & 14 during Utah's annual Transition Institutes from June Gothberg (2014-2018). There were 45 LEAs who participated in Utah's Transition Institute in 2017 and 57 LEAs who participated in 2018. Utah is also participating in quarterly NTACT Rural states webinar training. The Transition Specialist is receiving ongoing technical assitance from June Gothberg at NTACT.

The USBE Transition Specialist attended the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in 2015, 2016, and 2017, including attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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. **Indicator 3A -- Reserved**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

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

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	93.45%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	93.53%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Utah has had high participation rates. In FFY 2014, Utah introduced the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards. Simultaineously, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. As a result, participation rates have decreased. However, Utah will maintain targets and continue to promote participation.

During FFY 2016 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 (USBE) full Board meetings and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	47,364	43,288	93.45%	95.00%	91.39%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Historically, Utah has had high participation rates. In FFY 2014, Utah introduced the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards. Simultaineously, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. The law was further clarified in FFY 2015, allowing parents to exclude their children from "any assessment" that is mandated on a state or federal level. As a result, participation rates have decreased. However, Utah will maintain targets and continue to promote participation.

Utah's parental opt out of *all* students from statewide assessment increased from 5% in 2015 to 5.4% in 2016 for English Language arts. Parental opt out of students with disabilities increased from 6.5% in 2015 to 7.4% for 2016 for English Language arts, therefore not allowing USBE to reach our target of 95% participation.

During FFY 2016, Utah continues to promote the three main areas of the SSIP which focuses on middle school mathematics proficiency, including high expectations for all students, multi-tiered systems of supports in secondary settings, and improving students' access to core instruction. Information, 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 USBE full Board and committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	47,163	43,151	93.53%	95.00%	91.49%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Historically, Utah has had high participation rates. In FFY 2014, Utah introduced the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards. Simultaineously, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. The law was further clarified in FFY 2015, allowing parents to exclude their children from "any assessment" that is mandated on a state or federal level. As a result, participation rates have decreased. However, Utah will maintain targets and continue to promote participation.

Utah's parental opt out of *all* students from statewide assessment increased from 5% in 2015 to 6% in 2016 for mathematics. Parental opt out of students with disabilities increased from 6.5%in 2015 to 7.4% for 2016 for mathematics, therefore not allowing USBE to reach our target of 95% participation.

During FFY 2016, Utah continues to promote the three main areas of the SSIP which focuses on middle school mathematics proficiency, including high expectations for all students, multi-tiered systems of supports in secondary settings, and improving students' access to core instruction. Information, 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 USBE full Board and committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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. **Indicator 3A -- Reserved**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

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

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A 3-8	Target ≥	15.48%
		Data	15.48%
	B 10-12	Target ≥	8.50%
		Data	8.50%
Math	A 3-8	Target ≥	17.61%
		Data	17.61%
	B 10-12	Target ≥	7.08%
		Data	7.08%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the implmentation and evaluation of the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. Data on the proficiency rates of SWD on the DLM Alternate Assessment and proficiency and trend rates of students with disabilities on the SAGE assessment were shared with stakeholders. APR information, including targets, is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A 3-8	39,229	5,873	15.48%	16.98%	14.97%
B 10-12	4,059	343	8.50%	10.00%	8.45%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A 3-8	38,906	6,980	17.61%	19.61%	17.94%
B 10-12	4,245	278	7.08%	9.08%	6.55%

Reasons for Group B Slippage

During FFY 2016, Utah has continued to support the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, focusing on increasing student outcomes in mathematics in grades 6-8 (group A). Group A has increased their proficiency every year, demonstrating that Utah's focus is working. Utah expects continued progress and increased student outcomes that should be sustained and reflected in the grades beyond 6-8.

Among 10th grade students (group B) who participated in the SAGE assessment, proficiency increased from 5.69% to 5.80%. For 10th grade group B students who participated in the alternate assessment, proficiency slipped from 16.8% to 12.3%. A possible reason for this slippage may be due to the focused efforts Utah has placed in technical assistance (TA) to ensure that the students with disabilities have access to the appropriate assessment.

LEA's across Utah have been working with IEP teams in regards to the criteria for qualifying a student to participate in the alternate assessment. During FFY 2016, Utah has also provided professional development for teachers of students with significant cognitive disabilities to increase effective instruction in Utah's alternate academic standards aligned with Utah's alternate assessments in order to increase student outcomes.

During FFY 2016, Utah continued to promote the three main areas of the SSIP which is focused on middle school mathematics proficiency, including high expectations for all students, multi-tiered systems of supports in secondary settings, and improving students' access to core instruction. Information, 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 USBE full Board and committee meetings, emails, and social media. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

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

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	0%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

During FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. USBE 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. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? (•) Yes ( ) No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 23

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	123	0%	0%	0%

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

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2015 (SY 2015-2016) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.06%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.06% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged. Only 16 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and also suspended any students with disabilities in SY 2015–2016. Note that across the entire state, zero students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2015–2016.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

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

The State makes continued efforts to conduct periodical reviews of suspension data submitted by each LEA. In adddtion to improvements of the data collection system both the local and state levels, several USBE SES department meetings were conducted to discuss and plan for continued improvments to policies and practices related to disciplinary data collections. USBE SES staff met with LEA Superintendents to discuss the disciplinary data from each of their LEAs to determine areas of improvement and determine the need for technical assistance. USBE SES and the Utah Personnel Development Center (UPDN) (the USBE SES's professional development arm) provide LEAs and partner agencies universal, targeted and intensive professional development and technical assitance to LEAs through in-person meetings and conferences, webinars, online modules, phone calls and emails regarding positive IEP development and implementation, behavior supports, school discipline plans, IDEA discipline procedures. The USBE SES, in collaboration with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's Parent Training and Information Center) provides LEAs, partner agencies, and parents with information about all the above topics as well as the Procedural Safeguards.

- (●) 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 2015

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

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 30

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	116	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2015 (SY 2015-2016) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.06%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.06% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator for a suspension rate to be flagged.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

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

The State makes continued efforts to conduct periodical reviews of suspension data submitted by each LEA. In adddtion to improvements of the data collection system both the local and state levels, several USBE SES department meetings were conducted to discuss and plan for continued improvments to policies and practices related to disciplinary data collections. USBE SES staff met with LEA Superintendents to discuss the disciplinary data from each of their LEAs to determine areas of improvement and determine the need for technical assistance. USBE SES and the Utah Personnel Development Center (UPDN) (the USBE SES's professional development arm) provide LEAs and partner agencies universal, targeted and intensive professional development and technical assitance to LEAs through in-person meetings and conferences, webinars, online modules, phone calls and emails regarding positive IEP development and implementation, behavior supports, school discipline plans, IDEA discipline procedures. The USBE SES, in collaboration with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's Parent Training and Information Center) provides LEAs, partner agencies, and parents with information about all the above topics as well as the Procedural Safeguards.

- (●) 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 2015

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

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	57.66%
	Data	60.45%
B	Target ≤	13.43%
	Data	11.37%
C	Target ≤	3.00%
	Data	2.49%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

During FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education and works activley with the Utah Parent Center (UPC) in this proess.

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

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	71,440	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	43,986	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,632	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,706	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	36	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	124	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	43,986	71,440	60.45%	58.09%	61.57%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,632	71,440	11.37%	13.36%	10.68%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,866	71,440	2.49%	3.00%	2.61%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	33.42%
	Data	35.37%
B	Target ≤	43.36%
	Data	40.95%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

In preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) full Boar and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	10,516	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	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	3,911	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,823	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	210	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,911	10,516	35.37%	33.62%	37.19%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,034	10,516	40.95%	43.16%	38.36%

☐ **Use a different calculation methodology**

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
B. **Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and**
C. **Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.**

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

Historical Data

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

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	90.92%
	Data	88.21%
A2	Target ≥	51.60%
	Data	59.03%
B1	Target ≥	90.36%
	Data	87.21%
B2	Target ≥	45.19%
	Data	52.69%
C1	Target ≥	91.10%
	Data	88.98%
C2	Target ≥	63.37%
	Data	71.43%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after a data analysis and in consultation with the USBE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), IHEs, 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.

In preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and LEA Preschool Coordinators. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3715.00

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15.00	0.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	349.00	9.39%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1144.00	30.79%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1519.00	40.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	688.00	18.52%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	2663.00	3027.00	88.21%	91.12%	87.97%
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)	2207.00	3715.00	59.03%	51.80%	59.41%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15.00	0.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	422.00	11.36%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1354.00	36.45%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1552.00	41.78%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	372.00	10.01%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	2906.00	3343.00	87.21%	90.56%	86.93%
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)	1924.00	3715.00	52.69%	45.39%	51.79%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	24.00	0.65%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	284.00	7.64%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	748.00	20.13%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1712.00	46.08%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	947.00	25.49%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	2460.00	2768.00	88.98%	91.30%	88.87%
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)	2659.00	3715.00	71.43%	63.57%	71.57%

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

Data is gathered through the statewide Utah Program Improvement Planning System for Special Education (UPIPS). USBE SES utilizes this website to collect compliance, fiscal and other LEA data. LEAs and the USBE-SES can generate reports on the compliance data collected. These data and reports are used in the UPIPS Self-Assessment process, the UPIPS on-site monitoring process, as well as the Annual Performance Report (APR). The UPIPS system has an assigned section titled Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD). Teachers collect and enter the student information into UPOD as a student transitions from preschool to kindergarten. The LEA report section provides an overall statewide outcomes report with "n" sizes and percentages that are transferred to the APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state targets were originally set high in comparison to national trends. The State Child Outcomes Data Profile for Utah provided by The Center of IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) is a comparison of Utah and national data. Utah's percentages for summary statement 1 in all three areas are consistently higher than the overall national data. Trend lines for all three areas in summary statement 1 demonstrate small variations and are within the 1 standard deviation above the national trend.

Utah is currently working with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) on a statewide professional development system that incorporates evidence-based practices to implement the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) of the Council on Exceptional Children recommended practices that target student engagement. The program is titled Reaching Potentials through Recommended Practices (RP2). An application process is used to a select number of districts each year for participation. Utah is in the third year of implementation of the program with 11 of 42 school districts currently participating. Participants are trained on effective practices and are provided with both coaching and the tools to monitor their implementation fidelity as well as the student engagement outcomes.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	79.52%
Data	79.52%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

During FFY 2015, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at USEAP quarterly meetings. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings and via emails and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review, not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the IDEA Partnership's *Collaboration Continuum* and *Leading by Convening* as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education. In addition, the USBE works in conjunction with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's OSEP-funded Parent Training Information Center) in collecting and analyzing data.

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

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1462.11	1903.33	79.52%	79.52%	76.82%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	27.90%	6823.00

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Reasons for Slippage

In FFY 2016, the data showed a 2.70% slippage below the target of 79.52%. According to Utah's Indicator 8 sample plan, a largely different group of districts was sampled for the Indicator 8 survey in SY 2016-17 than in SY 2015-16, which could be a partial reasoning for the difference in satisfaction outcomes. Four of the largest Utah districts are sampled every year; of these districts, three saw a decrease in parent involvement scores, and one saw an increase.

USBE has examined the results by survey item and has identified those items with the largest decrease in scores from SY 2015-16 to SY 2016-17. One of the items to which parents reported less satisfaction was the IEP discussion of state and LEA assessment participation. There is a high opt out rate of students with disabilities on Utah's state standardized tests. The survey reported a 3.9% decrease in parents' satisfaction with the IEP discussion of their child's participation in state and district testing. Another item to which parents reported less satisfaction was having the Procedural Safeguards explained in a way in which parents could understand them.

To improve future parent satisfaction, USBE is implementing the following: 1) the release of a monthly newsletter, the SpEdOmeter, to LEA Special Education Directors to provide them best practices to support families of students with disabilities, 2) quarterly Utah Special Education Administrators Meeting (USEAM) to provide technical assistance (TA) for LEAs, and 3) intensive TA and coaching to LEAs with a risk score of 4 or 5 on their annual Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) determination related to OSEP Indicator 8.

The USBE and Utah Parent Center have also been working together to create videos for LEAs and parents that explain the Procedural Safeguards. Anticipated release date will be SY 2018-19.

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

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

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

The representativeness of the survey was assessed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the students whose parents responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all students with disabilities. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the grade level of the child; and (3) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 24% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a child with a speech/language impairment and 22% of students with disabilities in the entire sample have a speech/language impairment. Parents of students who are white were more likely to respond than parents of students who are non-white: 81% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a student who is white whereas 73% of the students with disabilities in the sample are white. Results were weighted by LEA to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

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

Was a survey used? Yes
Submitted survey: Utah Parent Survey

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

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

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 10

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 that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1	0	98	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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

The USBE used FFY 2016 data for Indicator 9 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USBE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. Data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A "Final" Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (based on Child Count data) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group.

For Indicator 9, 150 LEAs are included in the analysis of the SY 2016–17 child count data. Of these 150 LEAs, 98 LEAs met the minimum n-size 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. Very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 146; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 150. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using SY 2015–16 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use SY 2016–17 data).

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

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 2016, there was one LEA flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of this LEA was conducted. This LEA was required to submit documentation of their policies, procedures, and practices which were reviewed by the State to verify that there was no over-representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process, including student record reviews, evaluation, and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in this LEA based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

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

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 10

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 that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
8	0	68	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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

The USBE used FFY 2016 data for Indicator 10 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USBE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group within each LEA. Data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State is examined. A "Final" Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (based on Child Count data) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group.

For Indicator 10, 150 LEAs were available for inclusion in the analysis. Of these 150 LEAs, 68 LEAs met the minimum n-size requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated. Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students of a particular race/ethnicity with a particular disability. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful Risk Ratios from being 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.) (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 146; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 150. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using SY 2015–16 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use SY 2016–17 data).

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

the suspected disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

During FFY 2016, there were eight LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of each of these eight LEAs was conducted. These LEAs were required to submit documentation of their policies, procedures, and practices which were reviewed by the State to verify that there was no over-representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process, including student record reviews, evaluation, and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in these LEAs based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.28%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
247	246	99.28%	100%	99.60%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1

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 247 reviewed special education files, 246 students had eligibility determinations completed within the State-required timeline of 45 school days. The evaluation for that student was completed four days beyond that 45-school day timeline. The evaluation timeline delay was due to teacher noncompliance.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

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

During the 2016–17 school year, a sampling of files of students aged 3 though 21 who received an initial evaluation were reviewed through On-Site Visits, Desk Audits, and the State dispute resolution process for this indicator (as part of the general supervision system). The files reviewed came from 30 LEAs (school districts, and charter schools).

USBE SES has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements, including dispute resolution and general supervision responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). This responsibility is

administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities.

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

USBE SES's Results-Driven Accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the state intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process. UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of USBE support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the USBE according to the LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. Methods and procedures used to implement UPIPS are consistent, but flexible, in order to adapt to the individual needs of students, educational settings, and administrative realities.

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance (TA) on improving Results-Driven Accountability including compliance with OSEP APR Indicators. Utah received TA from the National Center on Systemic Improvement (NCSI). The USBE SES Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Specialist particpated in webinars/conference calls with the RDA Learning Collaborative. The State Special Education Director attended the NCSI Cross-Collaborative Leads Meetings and Face-to-Face meetings. In addition, the USBE Special Education Director and Coordinator attended the OSEP Leadership Conference.

The USBE SES also holds an annual Institute on Special Education Law in August. The USBE SES brings in national experts to review recent case law, national compliance trends and implications for practice. USBE SES staff provide information about state compliance issues and how LEA staff can improve compliance as well as outcomes for students with disabilities. Approximately 1000 LEA adminstrators, special educators and general educators attend annually.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

The State must clarify whether it identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014 and, if not, provide an explanation in narrative form of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, not including correction of findings

In FFY 2014, the USBE SES issued three written findings of noncompliance. The three students whose eligibility was determined after the required 45 day timeline were from three separate LEAs. The length of evaluations for those three students were within a range of 6 to 8 days overdue and each was due to teacher noncompliance. The USBE SES verified that all initial evaluations found to be noncompliant in FFY 2014 were completed, though late, and eligibility determined for the students (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In a required review of additional data from each LEA, a sample of files demonstrated ongoing LEA compliance with 34 CFR §300.301 (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is meeting the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301, including completing initial evlautions within the State-required timeline of 45 school days.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2015, one LEA was issued a written finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11. The USBE SES verified that the LEA corrected the nocompliance found in each of its two identified noncompliant IEPs. Then, the USBE SES verified the the LEA were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing the LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address evaluation timeline policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of the LEA's IEPs to ensure the LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by ensuring students were evaluated within Utah's 45-school day timeline.

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

In FFY 2015, one LEA was issued a written finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11. The USBE SES verified that the LEA corrected the nocompliance found in each of its two identified noncompliant IEPs through a post-correction review. The USBE SES ensured that both corrections were made as soon as possible and not later than one year after identification. Then, the USBE SES verified the the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing the LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address transition policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of the LEA's IEPs to ensure the LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by ensuring students were evaluated within Utah's 45-school day timeline.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,466
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	468
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,899
d. Number of children 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.	67
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	27
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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-f)]x100	1,899	1,904	99.90%	100%	99.74%

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, or f	5

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

In FFY 2016, five students were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by their third birthdays. Each of the five students resided in a different LEA. The USBE SES issued each of the five LEAs a written finding of noncompliance. The USBE SES then verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure all students are evaluated for special education eligibility as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year. Futher, the USBE SES reviewed additional files from each LEA to determine that each understood the Part B to Part C Transition process requirements and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Student 1: The Part C to Part B Transition meeting was delayed because the parent did not respond to multiple contact attempts. The late transition occurred in January, 2016. The LEA only had one late transition out of 323, resulting in a compliance rate of 99.57%. The LEA continues to provide training to new employees on timeline requirements and Part C to Part B Transition procedures and will consult with USBE SES when needed.

Student 2: The LEA staff were unable to contact the parent prior to the student's third birthday. Once contact was made, the parent did not

show up for the scheduled meeting. During the eligibility meeting, the student was found eligible and is now receiving services. The LEA had 271 transitions of which one was late resulting in a compliance rate of 99.47%. The LEA will continue to train staff about the requirements of Indicator 12 and expects 100% compliance in the future.

Student 3: The Part C to Part B Transition meeting was delayed because the family repeatedly moved in and out of the area. In addition, a new Early Intervention Services Coordinator was hired who was unaware of the family's mobility history. The LEA had 20 Part C to Part B Transitions last year with one identified as late. The LEA's overall compliance rate for the year is 95.00%.

Student 4: The birthdate on the student's original paperwork was listed as 04/17/14. The correct birthday was 04/07/14. When the parent attended the eligibility meeting, the team was notified of the error and it was corrected. The parents submitted the student's birth certificate for verification. The LEA had 142 transitions of which one was late resulting in a compliance rate of 99.92%.

Student 5: The Part C to Part B Transition meeting was delayed because the LEA staff member who received the student's file was on leave when the file was transferred. To ensure future compliance, the LEA has implementated a tracking system for all files to ensure all files meet timeline and other requirements. The LEA only had one late Part C to Part C Transition out of 125 resulting in a compliance rate of 98.98%. The LEA continues to provide training to new employees regarding timelines requirements and Part C to Part B Transition procedures and will consult with USBE SES when needed.

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

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

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

The Statewide database Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) has been fully operational since FFY 2009. TEDI accesses the Part C Statewide database daily to obtain a list of all children that meet four criteria: child is 27 months old, has not opted out, is actively enrolled, and is considered potentially eligible for Part B. Each child's data are transferred to TEDI with the child's demographic information. As the Part C database transfers a child into TEDI, TEDI then accesses the USBE's Statewide Student Identifier System (SIS) to provide that child with a unique identification number that will continue with that child throughout his/her public education experience 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 meeting, 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 USBE SES and the LEAs with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Part B. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. In the process of reviewing school district data on this indicator, the USBE SES followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Noncompliance with timelines for Indicator 12 (34 CFR §300.124) is identified during an annual review of the TEDI statewide database by the USBE SES Results-Driven Accountability Specialist and included with general supervision data.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2015, two students, one each from two LEAs, were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by their third birthdays. The USBE SES issued both of the LEAs a written finding of

noncompliance. The USBE SES then verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure both students were evaluated for special education eligibility as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year. Futher, the USBE SES reviewed additional files from each LEA to determine that each understood the Part B to Part C Transition process requirements and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

In FFY 2015, two students were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by their third birthdays in each of two LEAs. The USBE SES issued both of the LEAs a written finding of noncompliance. The USBE SES then verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure both students were evaluated for special education eligibility as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year. Futher, the USBE SES reviewed additional files from each LEA to determine that each understood the Part B to Part C Transition process requirements and was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	92.41%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
267	290	92.41%	100%	92.07%

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 27 LEAs with secondary programs that were monitored through on-site Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) visits in 2016–2017 or were selected for Indicator 13 file reviews only. Trained USBE staff or contract monitors reviewed 290 files using the web-based compliance monitoring application. Of the 290 IEPs reviewed, 267 of the IEPs, or 92.07%, met the State requirements.

As a result of the identified noncompliant IEPs, seven LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance, in FFY 2106.

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

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system, UPIPS, is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE review of each LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators that cover both compliance and student outcomes/results. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, and Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified need. USBE SES's results-driven accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the state intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process.

UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional

levels of USBE support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the USBE according to the LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. Methods and procedures used to implement UPIPS are consistent, but flexible, in order to adapt to the individual needs of students, educational settings, and administrative realities. While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis of episodic procedural monitoring to one of active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results.

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible and generally within one month of discovery. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In addition, LEAs are required to write a program improvement plan to address their process for ensuring that the regulatory requirements are being implemented correctly throughout the LEA. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of the transition plan. LEAs whose program improvement plans do not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE-SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds. Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices, and the USBE verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction.

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

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

○ Yes ◉ No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah's annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance. Utah received TA from National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) on Indicators 13 & 14 during Utah's annual Transition Institutes from June Gothberg (2014-2018). There were 45 LEAs who participated in Utah's Transition Institute in 2017 and 57 LEAs who participated in 2018. Utah is also participating in quarterly NTACT Rural states webinar training. The USBE SESTransition Specialist is receiving ongoing technical assistance from June Gothberg at NTACT.

The USBE SES Transition Specialist attended the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in 2015, 2016, and 2017, including attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

The State must report on the status of correction of findings or provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response, not including correction of findings

FFY2014

As part of the general supervision monitoring process, USBE SES conducted monitoring activities with 75 of 132 LEAs (57%) during FFY 2014. A total of 1,006 student IEP files were monitored. As part of these monitoring activities, 393 files from 50 LEAs were monitored for secondary transition requirements (not all LEAs provide services to transition-age students). The USBE monitoring system evaluates whether the IEP for all students age 16 and above 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. USBE SES also monitors for 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. Of the 393 IEP files monitored, only one IEP was noncompliant resulting in a statewide compliance rate of 99.75%.

As a result of the one identified noncompliant IEP, one LEA was issued a written finding of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

The finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 was the result of an IEP for a student over age 16 which lacked a transition plan. The USBE SES verified that the IEP team met and developed a compliant transition plan for the student. The USBE SES then verified the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing the LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address transition policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of the LEA's IEPs to ensure the LEA was correctly developing transition plans and implementing the regulatory requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2015, eight LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13. The USBE SES verified that each LEA corrected the nocompliance found in each identified IEP. Then, the USBE SES verified the eight LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing each LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address transition policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of each LEA's IEPs to ensure each LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by developing compliant transition plans.

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

In FFY 2015, eight LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13. The USBE SES verified that each LEA corrected the nocompliance found in each identified IEP through a post-correction review. The USBE SES ensured that all corrections were made as soon as possible and not later than one year after identification. Then, the USBE SES verified the eight LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing each LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address transition policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of each LEA's IEPs to ensure each LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by developing compliant transition plans.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. **Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
B. **Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
C. **Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

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

Historical Data

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

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	26.00%
	Data	19.35%
B	Target ≥	72.67%
	Data	64.63%
C	Target ≥	87.83%
	Data	79.46%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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.

During FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE)full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2016.

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1278.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	265.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	589.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	82.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	120.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	265.00	1278.00	19.35%	27.50%	20.74%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	854.00	1278.00	64.63%	75.67%	66.82%
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)	1056.00	1278.00	79.46%	90.83%	82.63%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah's annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance. Utah received TA from National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) on Indicators 13 & 14 during Utah's annual Transition Institutes from June Gothberg (2014-2018). There were 45 LEAs who participated in Utah's Transition Institute in 2017 and 57 LEAs who participated in 2018. Utah is also participating in quarterly NTACT Rural states webinar training. The Transition Specialist is receiving ongoing technical assitance from June Gothberg at NTACT.

The USBE Transition Specialist attended the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in 2015, 2016, and 2017, including attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	100%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	100%		0%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
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%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	87.50%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

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
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	10	null

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	7	10	87.50%		100%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		9.32%	11.54%	13.76%
Data	7.10%	8.70%	9.90%	

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	15.98%	18.20%

Key:

Description of Measure

For FFY2014, the target for Utah's SIMR was 9.32%. Utah's actualy data was only 8.70%, which did not meet the target but which was in improvment of 1.60 over baseline.

For FFY2015, the target for Utah's SIMR was 11.54%. Utah's actual data was only 9.90%, which did not meet the target but which was an improvement of 1.20 over FFY2014 and 2.80 over baseline. Utah is very pleased that so much progress was made during the Phase III year, as very few implementation activities occurred, and those that did were largely related to the improvement of expectation and beliefs. Utah expects to meet SIMR targets in future years.

See attached SSIP Phase I, Phase II, Phase III reports.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See the attached SSIP Phase I, Phase II, Phase III reports.

Overview

Data Analysis

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

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

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)

Infrastructure Development

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Phase III submissions should include:

• Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
• Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
• Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Leah Voorhies, PhD

Title: Assistant Superintendent of Student Support

Email: leah.voorhies@schools.utah.gov

Phone: 801-538-7898