



Utah State
Board of
Education

Special
Education
Services

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN/ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

April 2026

The Utah State Board of Education (USBE) must have in place a performance plan that evaluates the State’s efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (34 CFR § 300.601(a)). The USBE must use the indicators established by the Secretary of Education for the State performance plans (34 CFR § 300.600(c)) and must establish measurable and rigorous targets for the indicators established by the Secretary of Education (34 CFR § 300.601(a)(3)). The USBE must report annually to the Secretary of Education on the performance of the State under the State’s performance plan (34 CFR § 300.602(b)(2)). This document explains how the State’s performance is determined based on the local education agency (LEA) data for each indicator on the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).

Indicator 1: Graduation Rate for Students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)

$$\left[\frac{\text{Number of students aged 14–21 with IEPs who graduated with a regular high school diploma}}{\text{(Number of students aged 14–21 with IEPs who graduated with a regular high school diploma + who graduated with an alternate diploma + who received a certificate + who reached maximum age + who dropped out)}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported high school completion status and exit codes are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Data are on a one-year lag (e.g., data reported in 2027 is from school year 2025, not 2026).
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate for Students with IEPs

$$\left[\frac{\text{Number of students aged 14–21 with IEPs who dropped out}}{\text{(Number of students aged 14–21 with IEPs who graduated with a regular high school diploma + who graduated with an alternate diploma + who received a certificate + who reached maximum age + who dropped out)}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported high school completion status and exit codes are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Data are on a one-year lag (e.g., data reported in 2027 is from school year 2025, not 2026).

- ◆ LEAs should review the Dropout Event Summary for special education in the Data Gateway in September of each year to identify students that have been coded as dropout and correct any errors.
- ◆ The state target decreases every year.

Indicator 3A: Participation of Students with IEPs on Statewide Assessments

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs who participated in a statewide assessment}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs expected to test}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported participation codes from the assessment systems are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 9/10 (high school), for both reading and math.
- ◆ The state target is always 95.00%.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs on the Regular Assessment

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs who participated in the regular statewide assessment}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Proficiency data from the assessment systems are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 9/10, for both reading and math.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs on the Alternate Assessment

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Proficiency data from the assessment systems are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 9/10, for both reading and math.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates Against Grade-Level Academic Achievement Standards

Proficiency rate for all students who scored at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards

minus

Proficiency rate for students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards

- ◆ Proficiency data from the assessment systems are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 9/10, for both reading and math.
- ◆ The state target decreases every year.

Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Suspension & Expulsion Rates of Students with IEPs

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n-sizes that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for more than 10 days during the school year}}{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n-sizes}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported incident data is used for this indicator.
- ◆ The minimum cell size (numerator) is two students suspended/expelled for more than 10 days during the school year.
- ◆ The minimum n-size (denominator) is 10 students with IEPs.
- ◆ An LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy when the LEA's rate is equal to or more than 5x the state rate.
- ◆ LEAs should review the Discipline Incident Summary for SPED report in Data Gateway regularly to ensure data are accurate.
- ◆ Data are on a one-year lag (e.g., data reported in 2027 is from school year 2025, not 2026).
- ◆ The state target is always 0.00%.

Indicator 4B: Significant Discrepancy in the Suspension & Expulsion Rates of Students with IEPs Based on Race/Ethnicity

$$\left[\frac{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n-sizes for at least one racial/ethnic group that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for more than 10 days during the school year and policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards}}{\text{Total number of LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n-sizes}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported incident data is used for this indicator.
- ◆ The minimum cell size (numerator) is two students in a racial/ethnic group suspended/expelled for more than 10 days during the school year.
- ◆ The minimum n-size (denominator) is 10 students with IEPs in the racial/ethnic group.
- ◆ An LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy when the LEA's rate is equal to or more than 5x the state rate.
- ◆ LEAs should review the Discipline Incident Summary for SPED report in Data Gateway regularly to ensure data are accurate.
- ◆ Data are on a one-year lag (e.g., data reported in 2027 is from school year 2025, not 2026).
- ◆ The state target is always 0.00%.

Indicator 5A: Access to the General Curriculum: Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day

$$\left[\frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in kindergarten (K) and aged 6-21 served in the regular class 80% or more of the day}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6-21}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count Self-Contained Resource Attendance Management (SCRAM) environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 5B: Access to the General Curriculum: Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21 served in the regular class less than 40% of the day}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target decreases every year.

Indicator 5C: Access to the General Curriculum: Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}}{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target decreases every year.

Indicator 6A: Preschool Settings: Students with IEPs Attending a Regular Program

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number preschool of students with IEPs aged 3–5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 6B: Preschool Settings: Students with IEPs Attending a Special Class, School, or Residential Facility

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3-5 attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3-5}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target decreases every year.

Indicator 6C: Preschool Settings: Students with IEPs Receiving Services in the Home

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3-5 receiving special education and related services in the home}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3-5}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target decreases every year.

Indicator 7A1: Preschool Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills Summary Statement 1

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3-5 who substantially improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by time of exit}}{(\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3-5 who did not improve positive social-emotional skills [including social relationships] + number who did improve by time of exit)}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 7A2: Preschool Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills Summary Statement 2

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 whose positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) were within age expectations by time of exit}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 who exited}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 7B1: Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 1

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 who substantially improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) by time of exit}}{\text{(Number of PreK students with IEPs aged 3–5 who did not improve acquisition and use of knowledge and skills [including early language/communication and early literacy] + number who did improve by time of exit)}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 7B2: Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 2

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 whose acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) were within age expectations by time of exit}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 who exited}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 7C1: Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs Summary Statement 1

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 who substantially improved their use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by time of exit}}{(\text{Number of PreK students with IEPs aged 3–5 who did not improve their use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs} + \text{number who did improve by time of exit})} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 7C2: Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs Summary Statement 2

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 whose appropriate behaviors to meet their needs were within age expectations by time of exit}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs aged 3–5 who exited}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of parent engagement surveys that received a percent of max score of 67% or above without any "Strongly Disagree" ratings on the survey}}{\text{Total number of surveys returned from parents}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ State parent engagement survey data are used for this indicator. The four largest LEAs participate in the parent survey every year. Half of the remaining LEAs participate in odd years and the other half in even years.
- ◆ Surveys are scored based on parent response to the 12 items on the survey: Strongly Agree = 3, Agree = 2, Disagree = 1, and Strongly Disagree = 0. The sum of a survey's points is divided by the total possible points (36) to determine a "percent of max" score for each survey.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.
- ◆ Additional information and resources are available on the [USB E School Improvement with Parent and Family Engagement](#) webpage.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the cell and n-sizes of at least one racial/ethnic group with disproportionate representation of one or more racial/ethnic group that is the result of inappropriate identification of students eligible for special education and related services}}{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the cell and n-sizes of one or more racial/ethnic group}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM demographic data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The minimum cell size (numerator) is five students of a racial/ethnic group with an IEP.
- ◆ The minimum n-size (denominator) is 10 students of the same racial/ethnic group.
- ◆ A weighted risk ratio (WRR) is calculated for each racial/ethnic group that meets the minimum cell and n-sizes.
- ◆ When the WRR for a racial/ethnic group exceeds 3.00, the LEA is required to complete student-specific file reviews and a self-assessment. The USBE's review of the file reviews and self-assessment determines if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.
- ◆ The state target is always 0.00%.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the cell and n-sizes of at least one racial/ethnic group with disproportionate representation of one or more racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification of students eligible for special education and related services}}{\text{Number of LEAs that meet the cell and n-sizes of one or more racial/ethnic group}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported December 1 Child Count SCRAM demographic and disability category data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The minimum cell size (numerator) is five students of a racial/ethnic group and disability category.
- ◆ The minimum n-size (denominator) is 10 students of the same racial/ethnic group.

- ◆ A weighted risk ratio (WRR) is calculated for each racial/ethnic group and disability category combination that meets the minimum cell and n-sizes.
- ◆ When the WRR for a racial/ethnic group and disability category combination exceeds 3.00, the LEA is required to complete student-specific file reviews and a self-assessment. The USBE's review of the file reviews and the LEA self-assessment determines if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.
- ◆ Only the disability categories of autism, emotional-behavioral disability, intellectual disability, other health impairment, specific learning disabilities, and speech language impairment are included in this indicator.
- ◆ The state target is always 0.00%.

Indicator 11: Child Find Evaluation Timelines

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students whose initial evaluations were completed within 45 school days from receipt of consent}}{\text{Total number of students for whom parent consent to conduct the initial evaluation was received}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ State monitoring data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Evaluations delayed for reasons outlined in USBE Special Education Rules II.D.3. are included in the numerator.
- ◆ The level of compliance is determined at the time of the onsite visit.
- ◆ The state target is always 100.00%.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of children referred by Part C found eligible for Part B and have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays}}{(\text{Total number referred to Part B} - \text{Number not eligible by 3rd birthday} - \text{Number delayed by parent refusal to consent} - \text{Number of late Part C eligibility})} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEA-reported Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ The state target is always 100.00%.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 14 and above that include postsecondary transition plans that meet all compliance requirements outlined in the IDEA and the USBE Special Education Rules}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs aged 14 and above}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ State monitoring data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Compliance requirements are outlined in USBE Special Education Rules VII.B.2.-5.
- ◆ The level of compliance is determined at the time of the onsite visit.
- ◆ The state target is always 100.00%.

Indicator 14A: Post School Outcomes: Higher Education

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP at the time of leaving school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}}{\text{Total number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP at the time of leaving}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Post School Outcomes Survey data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Higher education is defined as a two- or four-year college. Respondents must have completed at least one term.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 14B: Post School Outcomes: Higher Education or Competitive Employment

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{(Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP at the time of leaving school, and were enrolled in higher education + were competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{Total number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP at the time of leaving}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Post School Outcomes Survey data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Competitive employment is defined as having worked at least 90 cumulative days in a community setting for 20 hours or more per week receiving minimum wage or greater.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 14C: Post-School Outcomes: Higher Education or Competitive Employment or Other Postsecondary Education or Other Employment

$$\left[\frac{\text{(Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP at the time of leaving school, and were enrolled in higher education + were enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program + were competitively employed within one year of leaving high school + were in some other employment within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{Total number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP at the time of leaving school}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Post School Outcomes Survey data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Other postsecondary education or training program is defined as any short-term education or training program, humanitarian program, or high school completion program. Respondents must have completed at least one term.
- ◆ Other employment is defined as having worked at least 90 cumulative days in any setting for any number of hours receiving minimum wage or greater.
- ◆ The state target increases every year.

Indicator 15: Dispute Resolution

$$\left[\frac{\text{Number of due process complaint resolution meetings that resulted in a written resolution settlement agreement}}{\text{Total number of due process complaint resolution meetings}} \right] \times 100$$

Indicator 16: Mediation

$$\left[\frac{\text{Number of mediation sessions that resulted in a mediation agreement}}{\text{Total number of mediation sessions}} \right] \times 100$$

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Reduce the number of students aged 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Post School Outcomes Survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period (from 45.65% reported in 2021 to 25.65% by 2026).

Indicator 18: General Supervision

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification}}{\text{Number of findings of noncompliance issued}} \right\} \times 100$$

◆ The state target is always 100.00%.