UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Honorable Larry K. Shumway
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
P.O. Box 144200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4200

JAN 24 2011

Dear Superintendent Shumway:

This letter is to inform you of the results of the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) verification visit to the Utah Department of Education during the week of October 11, 2010. As indicated in our letter to you dated July 22, 2010, OSEP is conducting verification visits to a number of States as part of our Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) for ensuring compliance with, and improving performance under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).[1] Section 616 of the IDEA requires the Department to monitor States with a focus on: (1) improving early intervention and educational results and functional outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that States meet the program requirements, particularly those most closely related to improving early intervention and educational results for children and youth with disabilities.

The purpose of the verification visit is to review the State's systems for general supervision, collection of State-reported data, and fiscal management, as well as the State's systems for improving child and family outcomes and protecting child and family rights. OSEP developed critical elements that were used to guide its evaluation of Utah's general supervision, data, and fiscal systems. The Enclosure to this letter describes the scope of OSEP's review of the State's systems and briefly outlines relevant statutory and regulatory requirements for each critical element. Generally, the Enclosure to this letter does not include descriptions of the State's systems because this information is available on the State's website in the State's State Performance Plan. OSEP's analysis of each critical element and any required actions, if noncompliance was identified during the verification visit, are provided in the Enclosure to this letter.

OSEP would like to recognize Utah's success in achieving and maintaining a high level of compliance with the SPP compliance indicators. OSEP also recognizes Utah's focus on improving performance for children with disabilities. For example, Utah's Academic, Behavior and Coaching Initiative (ABC-UBI) has been successful in assisting LEAs in the implementation of Positive Behavioral Supports and Interventions (PBIS) and Response to Interventions (RTI). The State reported that both PBIS and RTI are viewed as effective and proactive processes for improving social competence and academic achievement for all students. The State told OSEP that schools using these models have reported that office discipline referrals and in-school and out-of-school suspensions are dropping and administrators and teachers are gaining valuable instructional time. ABC-UBI is becoming a model of successful statewide implementation for

[1] During the week of October 11, 2010, OSEP also conducted its Part C verification visit to the Utah Department of Health.

widespread replication, dissemination and review. The ABC-UBI State leadership team has set goals of increasing evaluation and defining key features of sustainability to achieve successful student outcomes.

Additionally, OSEP appreciates the cooperation and assistance provided by your State staff and others, including staff from the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel and the Utah Parent Center in providing feedback and input on the State's systems for special education. We look forward to collaborating with all stakeholders and actively working with the State to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions or wish to request technical assistance, please do not hesitate to call your OSEP State Contact, Sheila Friedman at 202-245-7349.

Sincerely,

Melody Musgrove, Ed.D.
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Glenna Gallo
State Director of Special Education

Utah Part B Verification Visit Letter

Enclosure

Scope of Review

During the verification visit, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) reviewed critical elements of the State's general supervision, data and fiscal systems, and the State's systems for improving child and family outcomes and protecting child and family rights.

Methods

In reviewing the State's systems for general supervision, collection of State-reported data,[1] and fiscal management, and the State's systems for improving child and family outcomes and protecting child and family rights, OSEP:

- Analyzed the components of the State's general supervision, data and fiscal systems to ensure that the systems are reasonably calculated to demonstrate compliance and improved performance
- Reviewed the State's systems for collecting and reporting data the State submitted for selected indicators in the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 08 Annual Performance Report (APR)/SPP
- Reviewed the following–
  - Previous APRs
  - The State's application for funds under Part B of the IDEA
  - Previous OSEP monitoring reports
  - The State's Web site
  - Other pertinent information related to the State's systems[2]
- Gathered additional information through surveys, focus groups or interviews with–
  - The State Director of Special Education
  - State personnel responsible for implementing the general supervision, data and fiscal systems
  - Local educational agency (LEA) staff, where appropriate
  - State Advisory Panel
  - Parents and advocates

I. General Supervision Systems

Critical Element 1: Identification of Noncompliance

Does the State have a general supervision system that is reasonably designed to identify noncompliance in a timely manner using its different components?

To effectively monitor the implementation of Part B of the IDEA by LEAs, as required by IDEA sections 612(a)(11) and 616, 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), the State must have a general supervision system that identifies noncompliance in a timely manner.

---

[1] For a description of the State's general supervision and data systems, see the State Performance Plan (SPP) on the State's Web-site.

[2] Documents reviewed as part of the verification process were not reviewed for legal sufficiency, but rather to inform OSEP's understanding of your State's systems.

OSEP Conclusion

Based on the review of documents, analysis of data, and interviews with State and local personnel, OSEP concludes that the State's systems for general supervision are reasonably designed to identify noncompliance in a timely manner. However, without also collecting data at the local level, OSEP cannot determine whether the State's systems are fully effective in identifying noncompliance in a timely manner.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

Critical Element 2: Correction of Noncompliance
Does the State have a general supervision system that is reasonably designed to ensure correction of identified noncompliance in a timely manner?

To effectively monitor the implementation of Part B of the IDEA by LEAs, as required by IDEA sections 612(a)(11) and 616, 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), the State must have a general supervision system that corrects noncompliance in a timely manner. In addition, as noted in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02), in order to verify that previously identified noncompliance has been corrected, the State must verify that the LEA: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected noncompliance for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

OSEP Conclusion

Based on the review of documents, analysis of data, and interviews with State and local personnel, OSEP concludes that the State's systems for general supervision are reasonably designed to correct noncompliance in a timely manner. However, without also collecting data at the local level, OSEP cannot determine whether the State's systems are fully effective in correcting noncompliance in a timely manner.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

Critical Element 3: Dispute Resolution
Does the State have procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to implement the dispute resolution requirements of IDEA?

The State must have reasonably designed dispute resolution procedures and practices if it is to effectively implement: (1) the State Complaint procedure requirements in IDEA sections 612(a)(11) and 615(a), 34 CFR §§300.151 though 300.153, and 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3; (2) the mediation requirements in IDEA section 615(e) and 34 CFR §300.506; and (3) the due process complaint requirements in IDEA sections 615(b)(6) – (8), 615(c)(2), 615(f) – (i) and (o) and 34 CFR §§300.507, 300.508, and 300.510 through 300.517.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to implement the dispute resolution requirements of IDEA.

Required Actions

No action is required.

Critical Element 4: Improving Educational Results
Does the State have procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities?

The State must have procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

Critical Element 5: Implementation of Grant Assurances
Does the State have procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to effectively implement selected grant assurances, i.e., making local determinations and publicly reporting on LEA performance, significant disproportionality, private schools, coordinated early intervening services (CEIS), the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) and assessment?

The State must have reasonably designed procedures and practices that address grant assurances/requirements if it is to effectively implement the following selected grant assurances: (1) making local determinations and publicly reporting on LEA performance pursuant to IDEA section 616 and 34 CFR §300.600; (2) significant disproportionality requirements pursuant to IDEA section 618(d) and 34 CFR §300.646; (3) children in private school requirements pursuant to IDEA section 612(a)(10) and 34 CFR §300.129; (4) CEIS requirements pursuant to IDEA sections 613(a)(2)(C) and (g) and 34 CFR §§300.205 and 300.226; (5) NIMAS requirements pursuant to IDEA section 612(a)(23) and 34 CFR §300.172; and (6) assessment requirements pursuant to IDEA sections 614(d)(1)(A)(i)(VI) and 612(a)(16)(D) and 34 CFR §§300.320(a)(6) and 300.160(f).

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures and practices that are reasonably designed to implement selected grant requirements, i.e., making local determinations and publicly reporting on LEA performance, significant disproportionality, private schools, CEIS, NIMAS and assessment.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

II. Data Systems

Critical Element 1: Collecting and Reporting Valid and Reliable Data
Does the State have a data system that is reasonably designed to collect and report valid and reliable data and information to the Department and the public in a timely manner?

To meet the requirements of IDEA sections 616 and 618, and 34 CFR §§300.601(b) and 300.640 through 300.646, the State must have a data system that is reasonably designed to collect and report valid and reliable data and information to the Department and the public in a timely manner.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has a data system that is reasonably designed to collect valid and reliable data and information and to report the data and information to the Department and the public in a timely manner.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

Critical Element 2: Data Reflect Actual Practice and Performance
Does the State have procedures that are reasonably designed to verify that the data collected and reported reflect actual practice and performance?

To meet the requirements of IDEA sections 616 and 618, and 34 CFR §§300.601(b) and 300.640 through 300.646, the State must have procedures that are reasonably designed to verify that the data collected and reported reflect actual practice and performance.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures that are reasonably designed to verify that the data collected and reported reflect actual practice and performance.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

Critical Element 3: Integrating Data Across Systems to Improve Compliance and Results
Does the State compile and integrate data across systems and use the data to inform and focus its improvement activities?

To meet the requirements of IDEA section 616, 34 CFR §300.601(b) and OSEP Memorandum 10-03, Part B State Performance Plan (Part B – SPP) and Part B Annual Performance Report (Part B – APR), dated December 3, 2009 (OSEP Memo 10-03), the State must compile and integrate data across systems and use the data to inform and focus its improvement activities.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State compiles and integrates data across systems and uses the data to inform and focus its improvement activities.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

III. Fiscal Systems

Critical Element 1: Timely Obligation and Liquidation of Funds
Does the State have procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure the timely obligation and liquidation of IDEA funds?

The State must have procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure the timely obligation and liquidation of IDEA Part B funds, as required by the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), its implementing regulations in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) (including 34 CFR Parts 76 and 80), and the relevant sections of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars A-87 and A-133.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure the timely obligation and liquidation of IDEA funds.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

Critical Element 2: Appropriate Distribution of IDEA Funds
Does the State have procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure appropriate distribution of IDEA funds within the State?

The State must have procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure appropriate distribution of IDEA funds within the State, consistent with IDEA sections 611(f) and 619(g) and 34 CFR §§300.705 and 300.816.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure appropriate distribution of IDEA funds within the State.

Required Actions/Next Steps
No action is required.

Critical Element 3: Appropriate Use of IDEA Funds
Does the State have procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure appropriate use of IDEA funds?

The State must have procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure appropriate use of IDEA Part B funds, as required by GEPA, EDGAR, OMB Circulars A-87 and A-133, and applicable provisions in Part B of the IDEA.

OSEP Conclusions

Based on the review of documents and interviews with State personnel, OSEP concludes that the State has procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure appropriate use of IDEA funds.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.