

UT Part B

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

In FFY 2014, Utah either met or was in significant compliance with 17 of 25 possible targets on the applicable Part B APR indicators. These included indicators measuring graduation, dropout, assessment participation, discipline, LRE (ages 6-21), preschool outcomes statement 2 (i.e., functioning within age expectations), parent input, disproportionality, and compliance indicators 11-13.

During FFY 2014, Utah participated in a new alternate assessment, the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), causing Indicator 3C to be recalculated as a baseline year, and not comparable to previous calculations.

Also during the year, LRE (ages 3-5) decreased slightly, causing Utah to narrowly miss those two targets, but without slippage from FFY 2013. Impacting preschool outcomes, Utah missed three indicators measuring preschool outcomes Summary Statement 1 (i.e., substantial increase on rate of growth in each outcome). Although those targets were missed, Utah continues to demonstrate high levels of preschool achievement in comparison nationally, ranging between 87%-91%.

Despite the SSIP Phase I focus on high expectation and beliefs, effective instruction in core grade-level standards, and increased multi-tiered system of supports in secondary settings, Utah's number of exiting students with disabilities enrolled in high education has declined, specifically a 34% decrease in those attending a 2 year program at a technical college. While we saw an increase in youth with disabilities employed or attending some other educational programs, the 34% decrease was dramatic enough to negatively impact all three calculations and miss targets for 14A, B, and C.

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	Remove
ffy 2014 introduction final.docx	Emily Bytheway		R e m o v e
utsampleplanindic8april2015 (004).pdf	Glenna Gallo		R e m o v e
ffy 2014 apr summary.docx	Glenna Gallo		R e m o v e

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

142

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

General Supervision System:

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

Utah's General Supervision Process

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-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 USOE-SES continuous improvement monitoring system is called UPIPS and is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USOE review of each LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. 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.

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

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

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

- An effective accountability system is continuous rather than episodic, is linked to systemic change, and integrates self-assessment with continuous feedback and response.
- Partnership with stakeholders. The LEA works in partnership with diverse stakeholders. This collaboration affects the following areas: the collection and analysis of self-assessment data; the identification of critical issues and solutions to problems; and the development, implementation, and oversight of improvement strategies to ensure compliance and improved results for students with disabilities.
- LEA accountability. LEAs are accountable for identifying strengths and areas of concern based upon data analysis; identifying, implementing and revising strategies for program improvement; and submitting annual measurement and progress reports.
- Self-Assessment. Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a Self-Assessment process that focuses on improving results for students with disabilities.

- Data-driven process. The improvement process in each LEA is driven by data that focuses on improved results for students with disabilities. Each LEA collects and uses data on an ongoing basis, aligned with both the USOE’s and the LEA’s performance goals and indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the Self-Assessment process include APR indicators, personnel needs, graduation and dropout rates, performance of students with disabilities on state- and district-wide assessments, rates at which students with disabilities are suspended and/or expelled from school, and rates of identification and placement of students from minority backgrounds.
- Technical assistance. The focus of the monitoring process is on continuous improvement; therefore technical assistance is a critical component of the process. Key components of technical assistance are the identification and dissemination of promising practices and professional development. LEAs are encouraged to include these components as part of their program improvement plan.

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

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

Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices and the USOE-SES verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USOE-SES 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 USOE-SES’s review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USOE-SES and LEA actions, each LEA is in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%.

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.

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

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

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

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

Utah special education-related professional development needs are addressed by the Utah Professional Development Network (UPDN). The UPDN consists of multiple components intentionally focused on positively impacting results in students with disabilities. The model (attached) and accompanying descriptions identify significant components of the UPDN framework. Irrespective of established results-driven accountability and compliance priorities, this model incorporates the most essential professional development elements needed to strengthen teacher practice and subsequent student learning. Importantly, the UPDN model identifies the component parts, including the need for tiered LEA supports at universal,

targeted, and intensive levels (described above). Priorities were developed by stakeholders, based upon a thorough data analysis, and all provided professional development (PD) is evidence-based. Beginning at the top of the model, a ten item summary description of how the model operates is offered.

Ten Item Model Summary

1. Using the Annual Performance Report (APR), data, and advice from the UPDN Advisory Board and stakeholders, the USOE-SES leadership set PD priorities. These priorities include school-to-post-school transition, effective instruction, and student engagement. All priorities directly impact college and career readiness and prepare students with disabilities for skilled and competitive employment, involvement in post-secondary education, and independence.
2. The UPDN Core Team, in collaboration with the USOE-SES, organizes priority-driven PD for all LEAs, recognizing that all LEAs receive universal-level PD.
3. LEAs request UPDN support associated with identified PD priorities or needs specific to their respective LEA using the “single point of entry” internet-based request system. They click on a “need assistance” button and fill out a brief form, including contact information.
4. Within 48 hours, a UPDN Core Team member contacts the person requesting assistance to discuss LEA needs and directs the person requesting assistance to an approved provider.
5. Systematically-screened approved providers to whom persons or groups requesting assistance can be directed to include all groups are identified.
6. LEAs receive varying levels of support based on results and compliance data.
7. The coordinated system of PD/TA improves results for students with disabilities, as measured by outcome data.
8. Internal evaluation is continuously conducted for the quality, relevance, and fidelity of PD events.
9. External evaluation of the entire UPDN system is conducted annually to determine if the project is addressing identified goals.
10. Sustainable, positive developmental, academic, socially, and behaviorally competent outcomes for all students with disabilities that will result in attainment of the skills necessary to achieve successful post-school activities is the goal.

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

Attachments				
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove	
updn_model.jpg	Emily Bytheway		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">R</div> e m o v e	

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 2014, in preparation for the APR and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Phase II requirements and indicators continued to be shared with Local Education Agency (LEA) Special Education Directors. Changes and updates in OSEP requirements were articulated during these meetings. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USOE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections as well as the Parent Teacher Association (PTA), in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum, as well as Leading by Convening, as a strategy to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
collaboration continuum.pdf	Emily Bytheway		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Each February, the State reports to the public on its progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The APR is posted on the USOE's website (<http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/Quick-Links/Performance-Plan.aspx>). The final APR is shared at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Utah State Board of Education and USEAP, and with the LEA Special Education Directors after submission. Results are also shared with the Utah Parent Center, Utah's Parent Training and Information Center. Prior to April 15 of each year (within 120 days of the State's submission of its APR), the USOE-SES prepares and publishes a summary of indicators that are required to be publicly reported for each LEA. The report is posted on the USOE website (<http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/Quick-Links/Performance-Plan.aspx>) and is made available for posting on LEA websites.

The results of the FFY 2014 APR were reported to the Utah State Board of Education in the February 2016 Board meeting.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	66.32%	69.59%	71.48%	72.91%	74.37%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The FFY 2014 target had not been originally calculated as a 2% increase of FFY 2013 data of 65.02%, an option included in the ESEA waiver. The FFY 2014 target has been corrected and the FFY 2015 target updated based off of FFY 2014 data.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

The current approved (07/23/15) Utah ESEA Flexibility Waiver discusses graduation rates of less than 60% resulting in priority school status, but does not contain a revised state graduation target. Instead, Utah's Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS), described in Utah's ESEA Flexibility Waiver, requires that graduation rates of each school be examined and used during calculations.

As neither document specifically addresses state targets for graduation, and Utah stakeholders felt that a 60% target was not appropriately rigorous, **Utah will apply the target of either 85.7% or a 2% increase of the previous year as the state graduation target.** However, the Grads 360 structure does not allow for that flexibility, so the FFY 2013 target will require a 2% increase from the FFY 2012 state rate of 60.91% and the remaining year's targets are listed as projected targets starting with FFY 2015 and will be revised to show the required 2% increase if the annual target of 85.7% is not met. FFY 2014 targets were based off of the FFY 2013 data of 65.02%.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,650	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,884	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.23%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Data Discrepancy

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
2,650	3,884	65.02%	66.32%	68.23%

Graduation Conditions Field

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

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

The USOE applied a formula for the cohort graduation rate required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and specifically approved for use in Utah by the United States Department of Education. The graduation rate calculation is based on the number of students who enter 9th grade and graduate with their cohort. The calculation is:

Number of on-time graduates in the cohort

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

The following students are considered "Other Completers" and are not included in the graduation rate calculation: students who earned a high school diploma after their cohort graduated; students with disabilities who participated in the Utah Alternative Assessment (UAA) due to the severity of their disabilities; and students who received a Utah High School Completion Diploma by passing the General Education Development (GED) test. Utah used the same data for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education under

Title I of the ESEA.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 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
Target ≤			4.80%	4.70%	4.70%	5.60%	5.55%	5.43%	5.32%	42.00%
Data		4.90%	4.80%	4.80%	5.65%	4.50%	4.20%	8.90%	7.70%	42.00%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	39.90%	37.90%	36.00%	34.20%	32.49%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

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

The revised targets reflect Utah's move from Option 2 to Option 1 as the data source for reporting the single-year dropout rate. This represents the percentage of youth with IEPs age 14–21 who have exited special education by dropping out, as a portion of youth with IEPs age 14–21 who have exited special education. The target for the State is to reduce this percentage by at least 5% of the previous year's rate per year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14–21)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,444	4,765	42.00%	39.90%	30.30%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

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

Utah is reporting dropout data using Option 1. This is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Included in the denominator are the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died. Excluded from the denominator are youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in education, or 1,432 exiting students.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	97.00%	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%
Math	A Overall	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	98.00%	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%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	44,417	42,833	98.17%	95.00%	96.43%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	43,915	42,258	98.04%	95.00%	96.23%

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 2013 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. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ 3-8	13.44%	33.91%	42.17%	50.43%	58.69%
	B ≥ 10-12	8.67%	30.44%	39.14%	47.83%	56.53%
Math	A ≥ 3-8	17.06%	36.08%	44.07%	52.06%	60.05%
	B ≥ 10-12	7.15%	26.29%	35.50%	44.27%	53.93%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

FFY 2014 is a baseline year and the FFY 2014 target has been reset at baseline. Targets for FFY 2015–2018 will be reestablished during FFY 2015, upon completion of the ESEA Waiver and implementation of ESSA.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP Phase II, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from

general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USOE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections, as well as the PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A 3-8	38,554	5,181	17.38%	13.44%	13.44%
B 10-12	4,277	371	13.05%	8.67%	8.67%

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A 3-8	37,936	6,470	20.11%	17.06%	17.06%
B 10-12	4,322	309	7.86%	7.15%	7.15%

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 2013 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
Target ≤			3.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		4.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	132	0%	0%	0%

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USOE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2014 State rate (based on the 2013–14 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.08%. The USOE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.08% 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 20 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and also suspended any students with disabilities in 2013–14. Note that across the entire state, only 56 students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in 2013–14. More than 80% of LEAs have a 0% suspension rate on this indicator.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

As there were no LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs, the State found it unnecessary to conduct an additional review of any LEA policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as per 34 CFR §300.170(b). However, the USOE did provide ongoing professional development to LEA administrators, data staff, and special education directors to ensure accurate collection and reporting of data, as well as to address procedural safeguards of the IDEA, as well as engaged in ongoing general supervision monitoring.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	132	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USOE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2014 State rate (based on the 2013–2014 data) for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.08%. The USOE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.08% 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 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Three LEAs were identified as having potential noncompliance in the rate of suspensions and expulsions by race or ethnicity of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs. Following a review of any LEA policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as per 34 CFR §300.170(b), the USOE did not identify any noncompliance or significant disproportionality. However, the USOE did continue to provide professional development to LEA staff in those areas, to proactively address student needs and engaged in ongoing general supervision monitoring.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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
A	2005	Target ≥			50.14%	51.15%	51.91%	52.88%	54.12%	55.53%	55.84%	56.81%
		Data		48.68%	59.64%	51.40%	52.36%	53.58%	54.98%	55.29%	56.35%	56.81%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.28%	15.66%	15.25%	15.18%	14.91%	14.06%	13.82%	13.57%
		Data		14.72%	15.82%	15.40%	15.33%	15.06%	14.20%	13.96%	13.48%	13.57%
C	2005	Target ≤			3.52%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	3.00%
		Data		3.56%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	2.79%	2.59%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

As Utah LEAs continue to increase the percent of students with disabilities receiving the majority of

their services in general education settings, support must also be increased for both students and teachers in these settings through the development of tiered instruction framework documents and professional development supporting the implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS).

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	67,839	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	39,421	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,394	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,557	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	59	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	137	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	39,421	67,839	56.81%	57.23%	58.11%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,394	67,839	13.57%	13.50%	12.37%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,753	67,839	2.59%	3.00%	2.58%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data, historical targets, and in consultation with the USOE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USOE-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 previously 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 Phase II, 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP Phase II and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USOE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections, as well as the PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	9,686	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	3,135	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,115	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	216	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,135	9,686	33.02%	33.22%	32.37%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,331	9,686	43.76%	43.56%	44.71%

Actions required in FFY 2013 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
A1	2008	Target ≥						95.09%	94.00%	94.05%	94.10%	90.52%
		Data					95.09%	94.00%	94.80%	88.20%	88.51%	90.52%
A2	2008	Target ≥						52.92%	52.74%	53.24%	53.74%	51.20%
		Data					52.92%	52.73%	56.41%	47.60%	45.89%	51.20%
B1	2008	Target ≥						93.20%	93.25%	93.30%	93.35%	89.96%
		Data					93.20%	94.10%	94.50%	86.50%	87.95%	89.96%
B2	2008	Target ≥						48.70%	49.20%	49.70%	50.20%	44.79%
		Data					48.70%	51.84%	54.78%	43.70%	40.30%	44.79%
C1	2008	Target ≥						93.91%	93.69%	93.74%	93.79%	90.70%
		Data					93.91%	93.68%	94.35%	88.70%	88.42%	90.70%
C2	2008	Target ≥						67.20%	67.70%	68.20%	68.70%	62.97%
		Data					67.20%	67.97%	69.82%	61.90%	57.69%	62.97%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

During FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3472.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	22.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	331.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1063.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1514.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	542.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2577.00	2930.00	90.52%	90.72%	87.95%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2056.00	3472.00	51.20%	51.40%	59.22%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

After gathering input from a LEA stakeholder group and soliciting information from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, USOE developed a new data system to track preschool student outcome data (UPOD). Training with regard to the new system was provided to all LEAs through professional development, and ongoing individual work with LEAs was provided at their request. Further training may be needed with regard to the data system. As part of the data analysis, LEAs with slippage have been identified and will result in increased involvement from the USOE. Ongoing training will be provided to ensure the data system and process are being used with fidelity.

It is worth noting that information from the ECTA Center provided 9/15/15 shows that Utah data, compared to national data, is within the average range for the past three years, with no large decreases, and "within expected patterns."

Figure 1

Progress Categories

Furthermore, data from Utah is considerably higher than the national average for Summary Statement A1. While Utah's 2014 data shows a rate of 87.95%, the national average indicated by ECTA Center for 201314 is approximately 80% (see Figure 2 below). This shows Utah statistically far exceeds the national average and may indicate a need for adjustments to targets in future years.

Figure 2

State Trends

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	21.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	383.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1289.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1456.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	323.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2745.00	3149.00	89.96%	90.16%	87.17%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1779.00	3472.00	44.79%	44.99%	51.24%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

After gathering input from a LEA stakeholder group and soliciting information from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, USOE developed a new data system to track preschool student outcome data (UPOD). Training with regard to the new system was provided to all LEAs through professional development, and ongoing individual work with LEAs was provided at their request. Further training may be needed with regard to the data system. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback for development and revision to targets. As part of the data analysis, LEAs with slippage have been identified and will result in increased involvement from the USOE. Ongoing training will be provided to ensure the data system and process are being used with fidelity.

It is worth noting that information from the ECTA Center provided 9/15/15 shows that Utah data, compared to national data, is within the average range for the past three years, with no large decreases, and "within expected patterns."

Figure 1

Progress Categories

Furthermore, data from Utah is considerably higher than the national average for Summary Statement B1. While Utah's 2014 data shows a rate of 87.17%, the national average indicated by ECTA Center for 2013–14 is approximately 79% (see Figure 2 below). This shows Utah statistically exceeds the national average and may indicate a need for adjustments to targets in future years.

Figure 2

State Trends

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	26.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	232.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	716.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1745.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	753.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2461.00	2719.00	90.70%	90.90%	90.51%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2498.00	3472.00	62.97%	63.17%	71.95%

Was sampling used? No

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 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
Target ≥			91.00%	83.64%	85.33%	87.42%	87.33%	89.63%	89.27%	86.04%
Data		91.00%	84.00%	85.20%	87.30%	87.20%	89.50%	89.18%	89.83%	86.06%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1464.68	1697.00	86.06%	86.14%	86.31%

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

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

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

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

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 student attends school, (2) by the grade level of the student, and (3) by the primary disability of the student. For example, 24% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a student with a speech/language impairment and 22% of students with disabilities in the entire sample have a speech/language impairment. Parents of white students were slightly more likely to respond than parents of non-white students: 83% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a white student whereas 77% of the students with disabilities in the sample are white. Results were weighted by LEA to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

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

Since 2007, the USOE has employed a sampling methodology based on the ongoing UPIPS monitoring cycle. The sampling plan was updated and OSEP-approved in 2015. Data for Indicator 8 were collected from those LEAs in year two of the monitoring cycle plus the four LEAs that have an enrollment of more than 50,000 students. USOE has adjusted the UPIPS monitoring cycle to a risk-based system of Results-Driven Accountability instead of a schedule-based system. In response, we have also adjusted the schedule for LEA participation in the Indicator 8 Parent Survey. The statewide stratification and weighting used to

accommodate LEA size included in the approved sampling plan are still in place.

To increase the meaningfulness of the parent survey, a modified sampling plan has been developed whereby LEAs will participate in the Indicator 8 data collection process every other year instead of every five years. This allows for each LEA to receive results on its parents in a timely manner and to better determine how improvement activities they implement are impacting parent involvement; it also ensures the state results are representative of the state as a whole. The four largest LEAs (Alpine, Davis, Granite, Jordan) which have an enrollment of at least 50,000 students, will be surveyed every year.

LEAs were chosen for either of the two survey years. In assigning LEAs to the survey year, LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, and race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. LEAs were then randomly assigned to one of the two survey years. Each of the two cohorts includes school districts of large, medium, and small size, as well as charter schools.

For each LEA, a stratified, representative group of parents will be selected to receive the parent survey. The number of parents chosen is dependent on the number of students with disabilities at the LEA as indicated in the table below. The sample sizes selected ensured roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes.

Number of Students w/Disabilities	Sample Size
1–100	All
101–1,000	100
1001–5,000	200
5001–10,000	300

For those LEAs that have more than 100 students, and thus for which a sample of parents is 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 the state-level results, responses were weighted by the student population size (e.g., an LEA that has four times the number of students with disabilities as another LEA will receive four times the weight in computing overall state results).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	0	142	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

The USOE used FFY 2014 data for Indicator 9 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USOE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. Thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A “Final” Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group.

For Indicator 9, 142 LEAs are included in the analysis during 2014–2015. Of these 142 LEAs, 82 LEAs met the minimum “n” requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group). Many LEAs in Utah have

between zero and five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 132; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 142. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using 2013–2014 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use 2014–2015 data. Utah’s number of LEAs increases annually due to the increase in the number of public charter schools).

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

During FFY 2014, there were two LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of each of these two LEAs was conducted. These LEAs were required to submit documentation of their policies, procedures, and practices which were reviewed by the State to verify that there was no over-representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process, including student record reviews, evaluation, and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in these LEAs based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
9	0	142	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

The USOE used FFY 2014 data for Indicator 10 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USOE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA. Thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State are examined. A “Final” Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group.

For Indicator 10, 142 LEAs were available for inclusion in the analysis. Of these 142 LEAs, 56 LEAs met the minimum “n” requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated. (For each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated—one for each of the seven racial/ethnic groups times the six primary

disability categories). Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students with a particular disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 132; the number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 142. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using 2013–2014 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use 2014–2015 data. Utah’s number of LEAs increases annually due to the increase in the number of public charter schools).

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

During FFY 2014, there were nine LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of each of these nine 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 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
566	563	99.65%	100%	99.47%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	3
---	---

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 566 reviewed files, 563 students had eligibility determinations completed within the State-required timeline of 45 school days. Three students, one each in three LEAs, had evaluations completed beyond that 45 school day timeline. 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.

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 2014–2015 school year, files of students aged 3–21 who received an initial evaluation were reviewed through on-site visits, Self-Assessment reports, Desk Audits, and the State dispute resolution process for this indicator as part of the general supervision system. These files came from 66 LEAs (school districts and charter schools).

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

The USOE-SES continuous improvement monitoring system [Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS)] is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USOE review of each LEAs 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 LEAs level of identified need (attached).

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

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

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible and generally within one month of discovery. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USOE-SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in

its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The USOE verified that the two LEAs with findings of noncompliance are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.301. In the process of determining that each LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USOE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, including accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA

noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.301, including completing initial evaluations within the State-required timeline of 45 school days (and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance), based upon the USOE's review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (i.e., Desk Audits).

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

The USOE verified that all initial evaluations found to be noncompliant in FFY 2013 were completed, though late, and eligibility determined for the students (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In the review of additional data, a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with 34 CFR §300.301 (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). Each file was reviewed to ensure correct and timely initial evaluation completion. As a result of these USOE and LEA actions (as described above), each LEA is in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301, including completing initial evaluations within the State-required timeline of 45 school days.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,227
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	384
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,757
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	62
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	20

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,757	1,761	99.75%	100%	99.77%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	4
--	---

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

One student each in four LEAs had Part C to Part B eligibility determined and an IEP developed and implemented after their third birthdays, for reasons other than parent delays or referral less than 90 days prior to their third birthday.

LEA #14—5 days late; incorrect birthdate given to school district

LEA #18—8 days late; additional testing needed

LEA #03—47 days late; late referral from Part C, transition conference conducted nine days before third birthday

LEA #23—63 days late; IEP Coordinator was in a car accident which delayed the meeting

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 USOE’s Statewide Student Identifier System (SSID) to provide that child with a unique identification number that will continue with that child throughout his/her education in Utah. To ensure confidentiality, individual child-level data are only available to school personnel with the appropriate permissions within TEDI.

TEDI provides an up-to-date status of the Part C to Part B transition conference, the date of the child’s third birthday, and whether the child was found eligible or not eligible. The Part C database and the Part B database (TEDI) provide data back and forth on a daily basis. Before a child’s file can be closed out in Part C, the provider is required to reconcile data that has come from TEDI to ensure that the exit reason is accurately recorded for each child that has been referred to Part B.

TEDI provides the State and the school districts with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Part B. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. In the process of reviewing school district data on this indicator, the USOE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Noncompliance with timelines for Indicator 12 (34 CFR §300.124). Noncompliance with timelines for this indicator is identified during an annual review of the TEDI statewide database by the State Monitoring Specialist and included with general supervision data.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The USOE verified that the three LEAs (3 total findings, as one LEA had two instances of noncompliance, counted as one finding) are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.124. In the process of determining that each LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USOE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, including accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of the noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.124, based upon the USOE's review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (i.e., Desk Audits).

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

The USOE ensured that all Part C to Part B evaluations/eligibility and IEP development/implementation timelines out of compliance in FFY 2013 were completed, although late (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In the review of additional data, a sample of files was reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with 34 CFR §300.124 (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). Each file was reviewed to ensure correct and timely evaluation, eligibility, IEP development, and implementation. As a result of these USOE and LEA actions (as described above), each LEA is in accordance with 34 CFR §300.124.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
392	393	98.12%	100%	99.75%

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 50 LEAs with secondary programs that were monitored through on-site Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) visits in 2014–2015. Trained USOE staff or contract monitors reviewed 393 files using the web-based compliance monitoring application. Of the 393 IEPs reviewed, 392 of the IEPs, or 99.75%, met the State requirements. The review process that was part of UPIPS was developed to ensure that each LEA is included in the formal monitoring process.

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-SES) has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements, including dispute resolution and general supervision responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). This

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

The USOE-SES continuous improvement monitoring system, UPIPS, is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USOE review of each LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators that cover both compliance and student outcomes/results. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, and Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified need.

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

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

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

LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In addition, LEAs are required to write a program improvement plan to address their process for ensuring that the regulatory requirements are being implemented correctly throughout the LEA. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of 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 USOE-SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds.

Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices, and the

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

Data indicate Utah continues efforts towards improvement in meeting the compliance requirements of Indicator 13 and will continue efforts to meet the target of 100%.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 related to regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320, including having IEPs with complete transition services plans, were corrected. The USOE verified that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320. In the process of determining that the LEAs corrected noncompliance for this indicator, the USOE followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, including accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA findings of noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320, including completing transition plans that meet Indicator 13 requirements, based upon the USOE's review of representative data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits).

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

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

behind the continuing noncompliance): required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

During FFY 2014, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP Phase II, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors 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 meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP Phase II and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. As part of the infrastructure analysis, gaps in solicitation of stakeholder input from

general education partners were identified, resulting in increased involvement of the USOE Teaching and Learning and Title I sections, as well as the PTA, in an effort to broaden the input. The USOE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading by Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USOE and public education.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1287.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	268.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	573.00
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)	63.00
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).	122.00

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	268.00	1287.00	24.50%	25.25%	20.82%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	841.00	1287.00	67.67%	70.67%	65.35%
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)	1026.00	1287.00	81.83%	84.83%	79.72%

Explanation of A Slippage

A comparison of data between FFY 2013 and FFY 2014 reveals the same number of youth attended a 2-year college or community college each year (111 youth) and approximately the same number attended a 4-year college or university each year (117 and 115, respectively). Slippage is noted in the number of youth attending a 2-year program at a technical college: 71 reported attending in FFY 2013, with only 47 in FFY 2014, a 34% decrease.

Additionally, more youth enrolled in college but did not complete a term in FFY 2014 (46) than in FFY 2013 (37), a 24% increase. Reasons for not completing one term were similiar across both years.

A review of ACT scores, required for admisssion to most Utah colleges and universities, show that only 25% of all youth who took the ACT (including participating students with disabilities) met all benchmarks, an indication of college readiness (<http://www.act.org/newsroom/data/2014/pdf/profile/Utah.pdf>). It can be postulated, from these data, that youth exiting the Utah school system may not be highly prepared to attend and persevere in college programs.

Explanation of B Slippage

Slippage on B is related to the slippage on A. The number of youth competitively employed increased over the FFY 2013 rate by almost 6%, but that was not enough to balance the decrease in participation in higher education.

Explanation of C Slippage

Slippage in C is impacted by the slippage in A. The number of youth participating in other educational programs remained static (an increase of only 2, to 181, over the FFY 2013 number), and the number of youth engaged in other employment increased slightly (6.8%) from 175 to 187. The slight increase in youth in both employment categories (860 in FFY 2013 to 911 in FFY 2014) was not enough to offset the decrease in youth engaged in higher education programs.

The percentage of youth never engaged in either education or employment remained the same across both years, at 14%. However, the number of youth under engaged (e.g., did not complete one term of college, worked less than 90 days) increased by 2% in FFY 2014 to 6%. Reasons cited by survey respondents for not working or attending college include: health or disability reasons; unable to work (full time student); unable to find work for which the youth had skills; planned to attend school in the future; didn't want to attend school or work; and didn't have financial resources to attend school.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Using the NPSO Calculator to determine representativeness of the responses compared to state demographics, it is determined that minority youth and youth who dropped out of school are under-represented. Further data review indicate that, of all minority groups, only Hispanic youth were under-represented in the survey responses.

No disaggregate groups were over-represented.

Actions required in FFY 2013 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
Target ≥			75.00%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	
Data		100%	85.71%	25.00%	50.00%	100%	100%	75.00%	0%	

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	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 10. Utah reported less than 10 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 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	5	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	5			0%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Utah reports less than 10.

Actions required in FFY 2013 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
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%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	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 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	6	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1	5	6	100%		100%

Actions required in FFY 2013 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
Target ≥		9.32%
Data	7.10%	8.70%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	11.54%	13.76%	15.98%	18.20%

Key:

Description of Measure

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Overview

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Data Analysis

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

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

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

Statement

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Description

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (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.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

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.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

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.

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

See attached SSIP Phase II Report.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.