

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B
for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with
Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Utah



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Intro – Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Partb. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro – Indicator Data

Intro – Executive Summary

In FFY 2022, Utah met 23 of 51 targets of the applicable Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators. These included indicators measuring drop out, proficiency, educational environments, preschool environments, preschool outcomes, disproportionate representation, post-school outcomes, dispute resolution, and state systemic improvement.

All FFY 2022 indicator data has been reviewed extensively by the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) to ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD) by linking local education agency (LEA) data to improvement efforts.

Indicators 4, 9, and 10 were reviewed and researched extensively during FFY 2021. The IDEA Data Center (IDC) helped the USBE redetermine calculations, more appropriately identify LEAs, and improve the process for ensuring compliance. This led to increases in identification and the inability to meet targets. Utah regrets that we were unable to meet these targets but considers it more important to accurately identify and support needs within the LEAs.

The COVID-19 pandemic continued to impact Utah schools. Recoupment of lost learning is reflected in assessment data found in Indicator 3.

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

Intro – Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Intro – Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

157

Intro – General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal

management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the USBE Special Education Rules (Rules) state USBE has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements (20 U.S.C. § 1400; Rules VIII.C.-D.). The primary focus is improving educational results and functional outcomes for all SWD (Rules VIII.C.3.).

The USBE uses the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) to monitor and support compliance with requirements by LEAs. This system aligns with the federal Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) system to monitor states. UPIPS encompasses external monitoring by the USBE and internal monitoring by the LEAs. The purpose of UPIPS is to ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for SWD by linking LEA data to improvement efforts and ensuring compliance with the IDEA. This data-driven approach to monitoring provides a systematic way for the USBE and the LEA to evaluate the impact special education services have on student achievement and outcomes. UPIPS monitoring generates data Utah is required to report to OSEP regarding the indicators on the SPP/APR.

Data used for the SPP/APR indicators are also used by the USBE for the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) process. The USBE annually sends a letter to each LEA reporting the LEA performance on each APR indicator in relation to the state targets along with additional data points. The USBE determines a risk level for each LEA and a Targeted Improvement and Support Tier (TIST). The USBE provides tiered supports and activities for improvement and risk mitigation to LEAs based on their level of identified risk. LEAs must develop an annual Program Improvement Plan (PIP) as a tool in reducing their high-risk indicators and improve outcomes for SWD.

The overall system is based on the following components:

- **Continuity:** Monitoring is continuous rather than episodic, is linked to systemic change, and is integrated with self-assessment and continuous feedback.
- **Partnership with Stakeholders:** The USBE and LEA collaborate with diverse stakeholders in collection and analysis of self-assessment data; identification of critical issues and solutions to problems; and development, implementation, and oversight of improvement strategies to ensure compliance and improved results for SWD.
- **LEA Accountability:** LEAs identifying strengths and concerns based on data analysis; identifying, implementing, and revising strategies for program improvement; and submitting annual measurement and progress reports through PIPs.
- **Data-Driven Self-Assessment:** Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a self-assessment and root cause analysis process to review and improve outcomes for SWD using data that align with both the USBE's and the LEA's performance goals and the SPP/APR indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the self-assessment process may include the Utah State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) areas and SPP/APR indicators that make up the RDA score, personnel needs, and other LEA improvement efforts and initiatives.

- Continuous Technical Assistance (TA): The USBE provides TA and professional learning (PL). LEAs are required to evaluate and create a PL goal as part of their PIPs.

IDENTIFICATION AND CORRECTION OF NONCOMPLIANCE

The USBE reviews data collected from LEAs during monitoring, dispute resolution, LEA report/data submissions, and other areas deemed necessary to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements of the IDEA and the Rules. Data collected at the time of review is reported in the SPP/APR as the level of compliance.

CORRECTION OF NONCOMPLIANCE

OSEP requires all noncompliance be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the date of identification of noncompliance. The USBE method will require the least amount of time and effort for LEAs while providing the USBE with evidence verifying corrections. Before the USBE can conclude and report that noncompliance has been corrected, it must first verify, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, that the LEA: 1) has corrected each individual case of student-specific noncompliance, and 2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., subsequently achieved 100% compliance), based on USBE review of the corrections data.

Correcting Each Individual Case of Student-Specific Noncompliance: The LEA must submit documentation that it has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. The LEA documents correction by providing evidence to the USBE for review. When a student's special education file is no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction, the USBE requests documentation of communication with the receiving LEA regarding needed corrections to the student file to correct noncompliance.

Correctly Implementing the Specific Regulatory Requirements: In conjunction with correcting individual student noncompliance, the LEA is required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents correction by providing evidence to the USBE for review.

USBE TIERED SUPPORT

The USBE provides differentiated levels of support to LEAs based on the assigned risk score given through the RDA process. The USBE continually monitors IDEA compliance. A focus has also been placed on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student outcomes. The USBE has conceptualized its IDEA general supervision, monitoring, and accountability systems to support LEAs more effectively in delivering special education programs focused on improving academic and social outcomes for SWD and ensuring compliance.

SUPPORTS FOR LEAS IN ALL TIERS

The USBE provides support to all LEAs as they continuously review and improve special education programs. Supports and activities include:

- TA: documents, newsletters, website resources
- USBE Specialist coaching and support: assessment, accessibility and accommodations, behavior, collaboration with general education programs, data and reporting, dispute resolution, effective instruction, fiscal, inclusion, personnel preparation, parent and family

engagement, preschool, postsecondary transition, rules/regulations/policies and procedures, UPIPS

- Utah Special Education Administrators' Meeting (USEAM)
- PL courses: data literacy, recorded trainings on fiscal requirements, New Leaders' Summit (NLS) for new special education leaders, Running Start for new special education teachers
- LEA-identified needs submitted via the Professional Learning and Training Request Portal (TRP)
- Conference opportunities: Institute on Special Education Law, Meaningful Inclusion of SWD Conference, Transition Institute

ADDITIONAL SUPPORTS FOR LEAS IN ASSISTING, COACHING, AND DIRECTING TIERS

LEAs in these Tiers reflect an increased level of need. An At-Risk Support Specialist is assigned to contact LEAs to review data and determine the best ways to collaboratively tackle LEA obstacles. LEAs can receive two hours of support per month in the Assisting Tier, four hours in the Coaching Tier, and six hours in the Directing Tier. LEAs can request additional time as needed.

LEAs can reach out any time. The USBE regularly contacts LEA special education leadership. Participation in NLS is recommended. Other possible options of targeted support may include problem-solving, specific indicator support, root cause analysis, program improvement, and internal monitoring.

Intro – Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

USBE gives TA in a variety of ways to ensure universal participation: meeting, training, & monitoring in virtual & in-person formats; asynchronous & synchronous learning opportunities; a webpage w/resources for LEA staff including TA on the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Framework, paraeducator standards & manual; interactive modules for TA & evaluation of paraeducators who provide instructional support for SWD; utilization of Padlets to centralize specific information; utilization of a secure online document storage platform.

INDICATORS 1 & 2

- The USBE created TA for Indicators 1 & 2 on calculations & data reports. LEAs access a Dropout Event Summary Report annually to update inaccurate high school completion status and exit codes. TA is provided for submitting updates to these codes. The USBE gives new special education (sped) directors TA on Indicators 1 & 2 each year. The USBE is creating TA guidance on serving SWD transferring to Adult Education (AE). A Community of Practice (CoP) for LEAs to improve collaboration between sped, school counselors, & AE meets regularly. The goal is to decrease students exiting K-12 to attend AE & ensure SWD are provided options before leaving K-12 to enter AE. A USBE workgroup is addressing chronic absenteeism & dropout prevention & training on early warning systems & Functional Assessment of Absenteeism & Truancy.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE gave TA including 1% monitoring visits focused on students with significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCD), RDA coaching, a CoP focused on integrated coaching for LEAs identified as needing Targeted Support & Improvement for SWD, annual Indicator 3 data literacy meetings, individual LEA Indicator 3 data sessions, alternate achievement standards instruction, & assessment experiences including the USBE Assessment to Achievement initiatives.

INDICATOR 4

- The USBE gave TA to LEAs on Indicator 4 calculation including video recordings & availability of appointments to discuss.

INDICATOR 5

- The USBE created the Portrait of Meaningful Inclusion for Students with Disabilities (POMI) including an Implementation Guide & Self Measurement Tool. TA documents were shared at conferences provided across the state.
- The USBE gave TA on special education service time, environment, placement, effective instruction, & inclusive practices to support SWD across the continuum of placements.

INDICATORS 6,7, and 12

- The USBE gave TA to LEAs on early childhood environments, preschool outcomes data collection, & Part C to Part B transition requirements at monthly statewide preschool coordinator meetings & at PL opportunities.

INDICATOR 8

- LEAs at high risk for the previous year's survey cycle were offered TA including meetings which gave multiple perspectives as the USBE & LEA reviewed the parent survey data. Each survey question was reviewed to assess the implications of the findings, parent comments, yearly trends, & develop a plan to improve progress towards targeted outcomes & improving parent response rate.

INDICATORS 9 & 10

- The USBE gave TA to LEAs on Indicators 9 & 10 calculations including video recordings & availability of appointments to discuss.
- A TA article was in the USBE newsletter on FAQs about Indicators 9 & 10.
- LEAs found to have inappropriate identification were given individual TA during the corrections process.

INDICATORS 13 & 14

- The USBE brought multiple resources together w/Padlet on postsecondary transition assessments, the postsecondary transition process, virtual resources, & post school outcomes.
- The USBE updated Tips for Writing Compliant Transition Plans (Indicator 13) and Postsecondary Transition Services Examples.
- The USBE created an Indicator 13 self-assessment tool for LEAs to use in facilitating a root cause analysis for five of the most challenging compliance requirements in postsecondary

transition plans, in addition to utilizing the results to improve programming & services provided to SWD.

- Targeted sessions for LEAs to review indicator reports were given in a Canvas course & sessions w/USBE.
- The USBE held Postsecondary Transition Talks for all educators to receive TA on multiple postsecondary transition areas. The USBE provided virtual coaching to LEAs upon request for Indicator 14.
- The USBE gave coaching during Indicator 13 monitoring visits & upon request.
- The USBE gave a recorded Post School Outcomes Survey training to 84 LEAs. The recording was accessed by 75 LEAs who also had access to the live Q&A. Surveys were conducted by 40 LEAs & 35 LEAs followed up after the contractor attempted the surveys.
- The USBE facilitates an inter-agency state transition team w/USBE Career and Technical Education (CTE), USBE School Counseling, Utah State Office of Rehabilitation (USOR), USOR Pre-Employment Transition Services, & Institute for Disability Research, Policy & Practice School to Work. The team meets regularly to implement statewide goals for postsecondary transition.

INDICATORS 15 & 16

The USBE gives ongoing information about current trends in dispute resolution data & TA to address recurring issues at quarterly meetings w/sped directors.

NATIONAL TA PARTICIPATION

Utah's Part B IDEA determination in 2023 was needs assistance and the USBE has participated in National TA to improve outcomes.

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE attends the National Technical Assistance on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) sharing calls collaboration between SPED, Vocational Rehabilitation, & CTE; B-14 CoP; Students w/Complex Support Needs CoP; Early Transition Planning & the Coordination of Services CoP; & Interagency Collaboration CoP.
- NTACT:C & Utah's B-14 contractor with the Cooperative Education Service Agency #7 give USBE targeted TA to improve post-school outcomes for SWD.
- The USBE attends NTACT:C Capacity Building Institute & the Division on Career Development & Transition of Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) cadre meetings. The USBE Absenteeism & Dropout Prevention workgroup gets ongoing TA from the Student Engagement & Technical Assistance Center to improve strategies.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE got TA from IDEA Data Center (IDC) to update the IDC 619 Assessment & Section 616 Indicator 3 Protocols. The USBE participates in the National Center on Educational Outcomes; the 1% Cap CoP on the 1% cap & SWSCDs w/a focus on building the capacity of IEP teams to increase appropriate participation in assessments, further development & implementation of 1% data analysis, & best practices for inclusion of SWSCD. The USBE used TA from Council of Chief State School Officers to ensure access for SWD in formative & summative assessment. The USBE participates in the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Evidence-Based Practices Collaborative (EBPC) to talk current research

on evidence-based practices. The USBE participates in a multi-state low-incidence workgroup w/Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to collaborate & share data & implementation plans about assessment for SWSCD.

INDICATORS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15, & 16

- The USBE received TA from IDC to update the IDC Protocol for EDFacts discipline files. The USBE participated in the NCSI EBPC & attended the NCSI Conference.
- The USBE presented the POMI & Implementation Guide to the National Association for State Directors of Special Education.
- The USBE participated in monthly calls with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) & received TA from ECTA, Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems, & CEC Division of Early Childhood.
- The USBE collaborates with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's OSEP-funded Parent Training Information Center) in collecting and analyzing data to address statewide needs. The USBE attended National Association for Family, School and Community Engagement training where Indicator 8 outreach to increase survey response was a focus.
- The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) provided guidance. The USBE and its dispute resolution contractors participated in quarterly mediation, due process, State complaint, & IEP facilitator workgroups hosted by TAESE. The USBE attended the 2022 CADRE Symposium on Dispute Resolution & the 2023 LRP National Institute.

Intro – 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 children with disabilities.

The USBE provides PL in a variety of ways including:

- In-person and virtual opportunities.
- Asynchronous and synchronous opportunities.
- Protecting student instruction time by limiting meetings and PL experiences during school hours.

In July 2022, the USBE hosted an annual Institute on Special Education Law. Virtual and in-person options were provided. Current information on IDEA requirements was provided to attendees 1,298 attendees including educators, lawyers, and administrators. Sessions topics were on recent court decisions and trends, cross cultural approaches to dispute resolution, IEPs, compliance, tips for families in determining eligibility, paraeducators, absenteeism, anti-bullying, mediation, and specially designed instruction.

An asynchronous data literacy course was provided to LEAs in February 2023. Each SPP/APR indicator was explained including what the indicator is, how it is calculated, and where LEAs can find more information and form goals around the indicator. USBE held virtual office hours where LEAs could make appointments to review data and develop goals. The course has remained open and continues to be viewed as LEAs have questions about specific indicators.

In 2023, USBE hosted nine Meaningful Inclusion of SWD conferences across the state to introduce the POMI and implementation guide to educators, administrators, parents, and other community partners to 2,000 attendees.

The TRP allows LEAs to request professional. The TRP is available for all areas of student support at the USBE. The USBE coordinating staff meet weekly to review requests and assign staff to follow up on the requests. Requests lead to PL opportunities, TA, and support. Ninety LEAs made 123 requests in the 2022–2023 school year.

LEAs identified as high risk are provided additional TA and support determined annually by the TIST. All LEAs are provided PL, TA, and online resources. Details are outlined in the “General Supervision System” section of the SPP/APR.

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE provided training on Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 during NLS for LEA special education leadership with high-risk scores for these indicators. The USBE provides PL to educators on graduation options, postsecondary transition, and guidelines for students with disabilities during monthly Postsecondary Transition Talks.
- Running Start is a training for new special education teachers that includes specific PL on postsecondary transition processes. Writing Compliant Transition Plans is a Canvas course with associated coaching for participants to ask questions in each area of the postsecondary transition plan development and implementation process.
- The Transition Coalition Self-Study is a 12-week facilitated self-study in Indicator 13 involving compliance and effective practice, self-analysis of LEA data and team collaboration to create an action plan. Three LEAs participated in the fall of 2022. This was an increase over the previous year when one LEA participated.
- Indicator 14 training was provided in May 2022 to 84 LEAs. The recording was accessed by 75 who also had access to the live Q&A session.
- All postsecondary stakeholders in Utah were invited to attend the Postsecondary Transition Institute in June 2023. The Institute consisted of one day of content only and one day of team-based content and activities. A total of 290 people participated, with 200 participants representing 34 LEA teams.
- The USBE facilitates a Building Meaningful Lives CoP around inclusion and employment for transition-aged youth with complex needs. Site-based teams participate in a series of facilitated conversations and guided practice through webinars and workshops. There are approximately 40 participants.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE provided Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) training to all LEAS with a goal of improving student academic outcomes based on the Science of Reading (SOR) under Utah Senate Bill 127 of the 2022 legislative session.
- A two-year co-teaching coaching model PL has been implemented in LEAs involving cohorts of secondary academic coaches, teachers, and administrators to increase academic outcomes for SWDs in secondary general education English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics classrooms. This includes a book study and instructional coaching to provide support and guidance from USBE experts to co-teachers.

- A Math Round Table has been implemented statewide for special educators. The Round Table focuses on teaching the educators the content standards of Utah core mathematics.
- The USBE provides PL to LEAs on improving student academic outcomes including alternate achievement standards instruction and assessment, online book studies with teachers and parents, and accommodations and assessment administration.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE provided TA to LEAs on early childhood environments, preschool outcomes data collection, and Part C to Part B transition requirements. TA is provided to LEAs at monthly statewide preschool coordinator meetings and through PL opportunities.

INDICATOR 8

- PL on parent engagement was provided during a session of NLS to help onboard new special education leaders. The Indicator 8 survey has also been interwoven into other PL opportunities for Utah LEAs including quarterly introductory family and community engagement professional learning events and local conference presentations.

INDICATORS 9, & 10

- PL on inappropriate identification (under- and over-identification) and the potential impacts on students was provided during the Meaningful Inclusion Conference in June 2023.

INDICATORS 15, 16

- The USBE provided dozens of hours of PL to individual LEAs on a variety of dispute resolution topics.

Intro – Stakeholder Engagement

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)

- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

Intro – Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Intro – Number of Parent Members

152

Intro – Parent Members Engagement

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Twenty parents attended the APR Summit in July 2021 and provided input on indicators. Additional feedback was provided by parents through the survey sent following the event. The USBE included parents who did and who did not participate in the APR summit or respond to the subsequent survey by presenting information about the target setting process to USEAP, UPC staff, and the Utah Parent Teacher Association (PTA) leadership.

Data is shared with USEAP, UPC staff, PTA, and online annually. USEAP often bases priorities on the information provided from the SPP/APR. Comments and feedback are always requested and responded to.

Intro – Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The USBE discussed with members of USEAP and UPC staff ways to reach out to and connect with parents who are traditionally underrepresented in the stakeholder feedback collection process. Members of USEAP and UPC staff both proactively shared information about the target setting process with their parent constituencies from diverse backgrounds. The USBE continues to work with these leaders to increase the feedback we receive from traditionally underrepresented parents.

Intro – Soliciting Public Input

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The stakeholders listed in the “Broad Stakeholder Input” section were provided formal and informal notification of the July 2021 APR Summit and the additional survey seeking input. Mechanisms included announcements during meetings, emails, newsletter notifications, website publication, and individual conversations.

Notifications began in the fall of 2020. In June 2021, a flyer including registration for the APR Summit was provided to stakeholders through email and newsletters. It is evident the public received notification and responded, as over 100 participants attended and provided feedback.

Stakeholders were sent the survey following the event through emails and newsletters to provide additional perspective and input. The survey resulted in over 100 responses.

Intro – Making Results Available to the Public

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

Target setting processes and results were shared with LEAs, USEAP, UPC staff, Disability Law Center (DLC) staff, relevant Utah PTA leadership, as well as the relevant staff at all State of Utah agencies and most of the nonprofit organizations that serve SWD. The target setting process results were also shared in newsletters and on the USBE special education website.

There were no proposed changes to the FFY 2022 SPP/APR that required notification to the public.

Intro – Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

Within 120 days of the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR, the USBE prepared and published a report on the FFY 2021 performance of each LEA in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR. The report is posted on the SPP/APR/SSIP tab of the [Special Education Data and Reporting](https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting) page of the USBE website (<https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting>). Individual reports are made available to LEAs to post on their websites.

The FFY 2021 SPP/APR is posted on the SPP/APR/SSIP tab of the [Special Education Data and Reporting](https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting) page of the USBE website (<https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting>).

Starting in February each year, the State reports to the public on its progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The final SPP/APR is shared at the first regularly scheduled meetings of the USBE and USEAP and with LEA special education leaders after submission. Results are also shared with the UPC. The results of the FFY 2022 APR will be reported to the USBE in the March 2024 Board meeting.

Intro – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Intro – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

None

Intro – OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34c.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023, determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro – Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

1– Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

1– Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

1– Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

1– Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of 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 an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1– Indicator Data

1 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	67.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	72.91%	74.37%	75.86%	67.90%	67.90%
Data	69.36%	69.97%	72.36%	56.34%	66.92%

1 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	68.66%	69.43%	70.95%	74.00%

1 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still

statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

1– Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,593
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	242
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	309
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	107
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,223

1– FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY	FFY	FFY	Status	Slippage
		2021 Data	2022 Target	2022 Data		
3,593	5,474	66.92%	68.66%	65.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage

1– Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The USBE is working to set up our EDFacts exiter file (FS009) submission through Generate. As part of that process, we are doing a deep dive into how we include and classify exiters in this file

to ensure we are meeting the requirements in the FS009 specifications. One change to the way we classify exiters resulted in a one percentage point drop in our graduation rate due to students who graduated being reported as “returned to regular placement” at the time they graduated. We are working with LEAs to ensure the “return to regular placement” code is only used for students who exit special education but are still enrolled in school in the regular placement.

Another full percentage point in our Indicator 1 graduation rate is not attributable to exiter data methodology changes. Compared with the previous year, we did see a decrease in the graduate count of 64 students, or 1.8%. There was a relatively large increase (109 students, or 54%) in the count of students who ended the year by completing a certificate of completion rather than a regular high school diploma. Finally, there was a relatively large increase in students who exited to enroll in AE or to pursue a Graduation Educational Development (GED) (67 students, or 73%). The increase in students who received a certificate of completion, transferred to AE, or exited to pursue a GED meant a decrease of 240 students in the “pool” of students working to complete a regular diploma. If a little over a third of these students had managed to attain a regular high school diploma, we would not have had a decrease in our graduation count. For these students, the choices they made may well have been a sign of the lingering effects of COVID school closures and disruptions to students’ educations in the 2020 and 2021 school years. During those years, absenteeism and dropout rates increased, which may have contributed to these students struggling to meet graduation requirements by the end of the 2022 school year and pursuing other options for high school completion. USBE AE Coordinators reported, “adult education directors have commented that students are coming to adult ed with fewer credits since COVID. We did see a significant overall increase in the number of 16- to 18-year-old students coming to adult education in the last two years.” The number of 16-to-18-year-old students who took the GED in Utah increased from 1,262 in FFY 2021, to 1,468 in FFY 2022. The number of 16-to-18-year-old students who enrolled in AE increased from 2,112 in FFY 2021, to 2,572 in FFY 2022.

1– Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The USBE Graduation Requirements include a minimum of 24 units of credit through course completion or through competency assessment:

- Language Arts (4.0 Units of Credit)
- Mathematics (3.0 Units of Credit)
- Science (3.0 Units of Credit)
- Social Studies (3.0 Units of Credit)
- Arts (1.5 Units of Credit)
- Physical and Health Education (2.0 Units of Credit)
- Career and Technical Education (1.0 Units of Credit)
- Digital Studies (0.5 Units of Credit)
- General Financial Literacy (0.5 Units of Credit)
- Electives (5.5 Units of Credit)

- Library Media Skills (integrated into all subject areas)

LEAs use USBE-approved summative adaptive assessments to assess student mastery (Utah Administrative Rule R277-700-6.). Students with disabilities served by special education programs satisfy high school completion or graduation requirements consistent with state and federal law and the students' IEPs (Utah Administrative Rule R277-705-4.).

In accordance with Utah State Board of Education Rule R277-700-6(26) an LEA may modify graduation requirements for an individual student with or without an IEP.

An LEA may modify graduation requirements for an individual student to achieve an appropriate route to student success if the modification:

- Is consistent with the student's IEP; or student education/occupation plan (SEOP)/Plan for College and Career Readiness; is maintained in the student's file; includes the parent's signature; and maintains the integrity and rigor expected for high school graduation, as determined by the Board.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

1 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Incorrect FFY 2021 data was reported. Utah's actual FFY 2021 data was 67.60%. Utah's reported FFY 2022 of 65.64% is correct and resulted in slippage from FFY 2021.

1 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 – OSEP Response

None

1 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

2- Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

2- Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

2- Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

2- Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of 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 an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

2- Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	25.81%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	34.20%	32.49%	30.86%	25.81%	25.81%
Data	27.04%	25.75%	23.56%	17.27%	25.07%

2- Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	24.58%	23.35%	20.90%	16.00%

2- Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah's participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still

statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

2- Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,593
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	242
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	309
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	107
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,223

2- FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY	FFY	FFY	Status	Slippage
		2021 Data	2022 Target	2022 Data		
1,223	5,474	25.07%	24.58%	22.34%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The USBE identifies dropouts two ways: 1) the student did not complete the school year and exited as a dropout (left with an exit reason of Unknown, Withdrawn, Dropout, Expelled, Moved but is not known to be continuing in another educational program, Transferred to Adult Education, Exited to Take the GED, or Exited with a Graduation Pending status for which

graduation requirements were not completed by September 30 of the following school year); 2) the student ended the school year with the expectation of returning to school the next year, but the student was not enrolled by September 30 of the following school year (summer dropouts).

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

N/A

2– Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE notifies each LEA flagged with a high dropout rate in September and provides a preliminary event dropout report to review before the October 1 data submission deadline. LEAs are given guidance on coding corrections and dropout recovery practices through USBE provided PL, TA documents, and individually as needed.

Incorrect FFY 2021 data was reported. Utah's actual FFY 2021 data was 24.20%. Utah's reported FFY 2022 data of 22.34% is correct and did not result in slippage from FFY 2021.

2 – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State is required adhere to 618 data file specifications and related deadlines when reporting data for this indicator.

2– Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

None

2 – OSEP Response

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR reminded the State that it is required to adhere to 618 data file specifications and related deadlines when reporting data for this indicator. The State reported "[i]ncorrect FFY 2021 data was reported. Utah's actual FFY 2021 data was 24.20%. Utah's reported FFY 2022 data of 22.34% is correct and did not result in slippage from FFY 2021."

2 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

3A – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

3A – Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

3A – Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

3A – Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A – Indicator Data

3A – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	90.64%

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	81.14%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	76.68%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	90.21%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	77.45%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	78.12%

3A – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

3A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

3A – FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3A – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

3A – Reading Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3A – Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,710	6,213	11,542
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	7,566	4,773	5,131
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	106	71	2,831
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	462	456	888

3A – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

3A – Math Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3A – Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,709	6,209	11,536
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	7,500	4,626	5,233
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	149	70	2,889
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	459	458	890

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

3A – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,134	8,710		95.00%	93.39%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,300	6,213		95.00%	85.31%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	8,850	11,542	77.64%	95.00%	76.68%	N/A	No Slippage

3A – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,108	8,709		95.00%	93.10%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,154	6,209		95.00%	83.01%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	9,012	11,536	72.25%	95.00%	78.12%	N/A	No Slippage

3A – Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

3A – Public Reporting Information

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

Utah’s regular assessments include the Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) assessment for grades 4 and 8 and the Utah Aspire Plus (UA+) assessment for grades 9 and 10. Each school’s overall participation rates for regular assessments are posted on their individual school report cards available on Utah’s School Report Card website (<https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/>).

Participation rates of SWD who participated with accommodations and without accommodations on the regular assessment and who participated on the alternate assessment are reported on the USBE Data and Statistics Report webpage (<https://www.schools.utah.gov/datastatistics/reports>). On the “Assessments” tab under the “Alternate and Regular Assessments for Students with Disabilities (SWD)” header, the most recent school year’s data will be linked to an Excel spreadsheet.

- The “Participation by Assessment Type” tab of the spreadsheet reports the number of SWD tested, the participation percentage of SWD in the regular assessment without accommodations, the participation percent of SWD in the regular assessment with

accommodations, and the participation percent of SWD in the alternate assessment at the state, LEA, and school levels.

- The “Notes” tab of the spreadsheet outlines the USBE’s policy for protecting students’ personally identifiable information. The policy includes protecting data for groups with fewer than 10 students by reporting it as “n<10.” Additionally, for groups with fewer than 40 students, counts are not shown, and percentages are obscured by providing the range within which the percentage falls (e.g., 43% would display as 40-49%). Percentages that are close to 100% or 0% are also not reported. This is indicated by a = or > (e.g., = 95%).

3A – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Starting FFY 2022, Utah’s Group C (Grade HS) data changed from including just one high school grade level to including both grades 9 and 10. Due to the data source change, we had to revise baselines for Group C.

The new Indicator 3A baselines for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) is 76.68% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.
- Math Group C (Grade HS) is 78.12% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.

The new Indicator 3A targets for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 95%, FFY 2023 95%, FFY 2024 95%, FFY 2025 95%.
- Math Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 95%, FFY 2023 95%, FFY 2024 95%, FFY 2025 95%.

These new baselines and targets were reviewed and approved by LEA special education directors, LEA assessment directors, and the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel during three formal meetings. They were also reviewed with other stakeholders following the usual stakeholder process previously outlined in this report.

Incorrect FFY 2021 data was reported for Groups A (Grade 4) and B (Grade 8).

- Utah’s actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) was 93.10%. Utah’s reported Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) of 93.39% is correct.
- Utah’s actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) was 84.97%. Utah’s reported Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) of 85.31% is correct.
- Utah’s actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group A (Grade 4) was 92.57%. Utah’s reported Math data for Group A (Grade 4) of 93.10% is correct.
- Utah’s actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group B (Grade 8) was 82.12%. Utah’s reported Math data for Group B (Grade 8) of 83.01% is correct.

Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2021 data was grade 9 data only. Utah’s Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 data includes grades 9 and 10. The USBE will be working with stakeholders to reset targets and report the new targets during the clarification period.

3A – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A – OSEP Response

The State has revised the Grade HS Reading and Grade HS Math baselines for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

3A – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

3B – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

3B – Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

3B – Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)].

Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

3B – Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B – Indicator Data

3B – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	14.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	7.31%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	8.31%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	19.74%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.02%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	4.01%

3B – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.75%	15.00%	15.48%	16.45%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	7.67%	8.03%	8.74%	10.17%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	8.31%	8.48%	8.83%	9.51%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	19.91%	20.09%	20.43%	21.12%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.15%	6.28%	6.54%	7.05%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	4.01%	4.20%	4.60%	5.38%

3B – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

3B – FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3B – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

3B – Reading Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3B – Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,672	4,844	7,962
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,374	380	473

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	7	4	189

3B – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

3B – Math Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3B – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	7,649	4,696	8,122
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,758	301	242
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11	2	84

(1) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

3B – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,381	7,672		14.75%	18.00%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	384	4,844		7.67%	7.93%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	662	7,962	6.31%	8.31%	8.31%	N/A	N/A

3B – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,769	7,649		19.91%	23.13%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	303	4,696		6.15%	6.45%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	326	8,122	5.67%	4.01%	4.01%	N/A	N/A

3B – Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

3B – Public Reporting Information

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

Utah’s regular assessments include the RISE assessment for grades 4 and 8 and the UA+ assessment for grades 9 and 10. Each school’s achievement results for regular assessments are posted on their individual school report card available on Utah's School Report Card website: <https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/>.

- State-level data can be viewed by clicking the "View State Report" button in the "ABOUT SCHOOL REPORT CARDS" section of the homepage. From the "PERFORMANCE" tab, the grade range (K-8 and High School) can be selected at the top. Additional details for achievement can be viewed by clicking the "View Details" on the "Achievement" tile, then again for each individual subject.

3B – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Starting FFY 2022, Utah's Group C (Grade HS) data changed from including just one high school grade level to including both grades 9 and 10. Due to the data source change, we had to revise baselines for Group C.

The new Indicator 3B baselines for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) is 8.31% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.
- Math Group C (Grade HS) is 4.01% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.

The new Indicator 3B targets for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 8.31%, FFY 2023 8.48%, FFY 2024 8.83%, FFY 2025 9.51%
- Math Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 4.01%, FFY 2023 4.20%, FFY 2024 4.60%, FFY 2025 5.38%

USBE set new proposed targets for Group C (HS) using the following methodology. We compared data for the previous three years for grade 10 alone and for grades 9 and 10 combined. We noted that the data and trends for the two different HS grade groups were similar, so we determined that it would be appropriate to set our new proposed targets using the same trajectory as was previously used in our targets. Targets for the first of the two remaining years have smaller increases from year to year and the final year's target (for FFY 2025) has a larger increase.

These new baselines and targets were reviewed and approved by LEA special education directors, LEA assessment directors, and the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel during three formal meetings. They were also reviewed with other stakeholders following the usual stakeholder process previously outlined in this report.

Incorrect FFY 2021 data was reported for Groups A (Grade 4) and B (Grade 8).

- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) was 16.52%. Utah's reported Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) of 18.00% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) was 7.81%. Utah's reported Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) of 7.93% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group A (Grade 4) was 21.51%. Utah's reported Math data for Group A (Grade 4) of 23.13% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group B (Grade 8) was 6.85%. Utah's reported Math data for Group B (Grade 8) of 6.45% is correct.

Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2021 data was grade 9 data only. Utah's Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 data includes grades 9 and 10. The USBE will be working with stakeholders to reset targets and report the new targets during the clarification period.

3B – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B – OSEP Response

The State has revised the Grade HS Reading and the Grade HS Math baselines for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State revised the Grade HS Reading and the Grade HS Math targets for this indicator, through FFY 2025, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

3C – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

3C – Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

3C – Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

3C – Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

3C – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	15.06%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	23.74%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	27.59%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	31.43%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.24%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	14.16%

3C – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	15.17%	15.28%	15.49%	15.92%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	23.91%	24.09%	24.43%	25.12%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	27.59%	27.77%	28.14%	28.88%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	31.56%	31.68%	31.93%	32.43%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.38%	6.53%	6.81%	7.38%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	14.16%	14.31%	14.61%	15.20%

3C – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

3C – FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3C – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

3C – Reading Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3C – Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	462	456	888
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	54	99	245

3C – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

3C – Math Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3C – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	459	458	890
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	141	38	126

3C – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	54	462		15.17%	11.69%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	99	456		23.91%	21.71%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	245	888	24.01%	27.59%	27.59%	N/A	N/A

3C – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	141	459		31.56%	30.72%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	38	458		6.38%	8.30%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	126	890	16.67%	14.16%	14.16%	N/A	N/A

3C – Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

3C – Public Reporting Information

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

The achievement of SWD on Utah's alternate assessment, DLM, for grades 4, 8, and 10 are reported on the USBE Data and Statistics Reports webpage (<https://www.schools.utah.gov/datastatistics/reports>). On the "Assessments" tab under the "Alternate and Regular Assessments for Students with Disabilities (SWD)" header, the most recent school year's data will be linked to an Excel spreadsheet.

- The "Proficiency by Subject Area" tab reports the proficiency of SWD who participated in the alternate assessment, a comparison to the proficiency of SWD who participated in the regular assessment, and a comparison to the proficiency of all students who participated in the regular assessment by subject area.

- The "Proficiency by Grade Level" tab reports the proficiency of SWD who participated in the alternate assessment, a comparison to the proficiency of SWD who participated in the regular assessment, and a comparison to the proficiency of all students who participated in the regular assessment by grade level.
- The "Notes" tab outlines USBE's policy for protecting students' personally identifiable information. Data for groups with fewer than 10 students are reported as "n<10." For groups with fewer than forty students, counts are not shown, and percentages are obscured by providing the range within which the percentage falls (e.g., 43% would display as 40-49%). Percentages that are close to 100% or 0% are also not reported. This is indicated by a = or > (e.g., = 95%)

3C – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Starting FFY 2022, Utah's Group C (Grade HS) data changed from including just one high school grade level to including both grades 9 and 10. Due to the data source change, we had to revise baselines for Group C.

The new Indicator 3C baselines for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) is 27.59% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.
- Math Group C (Grade HS) is 14.16% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.

The new Indicator 3C targets for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 27.59%, FFY 2023 27.77%, FFY 2024 28.14%, FFY 2025 28.88%
- Math Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 14.16%, FFY 2023 14.13%, FFY 2024 14.61%, FFY 2025 15.20%

USBE set new proposed targets for Group C (HS) using the following methodology. We compared data for the previous three years for grade 10 alone and for grades 9 and 10 combined. We noted that the data and trends for the two different HS grade groups were similar, so we determined that it would be appropriate to set our new proposed targets using the same trajectory as was previously used in our targets. Targets for the first of the two remaining years have smaller increases from year to year and the final year's target (for FFY 2025) has a larger increase.

These new baselines and targets were reviewed and approved by LEA special education directors, LEA assessment directors, and the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel during three formal meetings. They were also reviewed with other stakeholders following the usual stakeholder process previously outlined in this report.

Incorrect FFY 2021 data was reported for Groups A (Grade 4) and B (Grade 8).

- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) was 12.69%. Utah's reported Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) of 11.69% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) was 26.46%. Utah's reported Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) of 21.71% is correct.

- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group A (Grade 4) was 30.07%. Utah's reported Math data for Group A (Grade 4) of 30.72% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group B (Grade 8) was 7.94%. Utah's reported Math data for Group B (Grade 8) of 8.30% is correct.

Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2021 data was grade 9 data only. Utah's Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 data includes grades 9 and 10. The USBE will be working with stakeholders to reset targets and report the new targets during the clarification period.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the Grade HS Reading and the Grade HS Math baselines for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State revised the Grade HS Reading and Math targets for this indicator, through FFY 2025, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

3D – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

3D – Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

3D – Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

3D – Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D – Indicator Data

3D – Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	23.31
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	35.63
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	36.27
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	25.22
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	30.51
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	26.21

3D – Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.19	23.07	22.84	22.36
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.51	35.39	35.15	34.67
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	36.27	36.03	35.55	34.59
Math	A <=	Grade 4	25.10	24.98	24.74	24.25
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.43	30.35	30.19	29.86
Math	C <=	Grade HS	26.21	26.11	25.92	25.52

3D – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

- Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

3D – FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3D – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

3D – Reading Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3D – Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	48,573	47,191	88,115
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,672	4,844	7,962

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	21,439	19,762	38,785
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9	5	505
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,374	380	473
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	7	4	189

3D – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

3D – Math Assessment Date

01/10/2024

3D – Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	48,451	46,715	88,076
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,649	4,696	8,122
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	23,918	17,877	26,335
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	42	9	286
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,758	301	242
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11	2	84

(1) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

3D – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.00%	44.16%		23.19	26.16	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	7.93%	41.89%		35.51	33.96	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	8.31%	44.59%	33.62	36.27	36.27	N/A	N/A

3D – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23.13%	49.45%		25.10	26.32	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	6.45%	38.29%		30.43	31.84	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	4.01%	30.23%	32.25	26.21	26.21	N/A	N/A

3D – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Starting FFY 2022, Utah's Group C (Grade HS) data changed from including just one high school grade level to including both grades 9 and 10. Due to the data source change, we had to revise baselines for Group C.

The new Indicator 3D baselines for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) is 36.27% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.

- Math Group C (Grade HS) is 26.21% and is based on the actual participation rate for Group C in FFY 2022.

The new Indicator 3D targets for Group C (Grade HS) are:

- Reading Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 36.27%, FFY 2023 36.03%, FFY 2024 35.55%, FFY 2025 34.59%
- Math Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 26.21%, FFY 2023 26.11%, FFY 2024 25.92%, FFY 2025 25.52%

USBE set new proposed targets for Group C (HS) using the following methodology. We compared data for the previous three years for grade 10 alone and for grades 9 and 10 combined. We noted that the data and trends for the two different HS grade groups were similar, so we determined that it would be appropriate to set our new proposed targets using the same trajectory as was previously used in our targets. Targets for the first of the two remaining years have smaller increases from year to year and the final year's target (for FFY 2025) has a larger increase.

These new baselines and targets were reviewed and approved by LEA special education directors, LEA assessment directors, and the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel during three formal meetings. They were also reviewed with other stakeholders following the usual stakeholder process previously outlined in this report.

Incorrect FFY 2021 data was reported for Groups A (Grade 4) and B (Grade 8).

- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) was 26.26%. Utah's reported Reading data for Group A (Grade 4) of 26.16% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) was 34.06%. Utah's reported Reading data for Group B (Grade 8) of 33.96% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group A (Grade 4) was 27.20%. Utah's reported Math data for Group A (Grade 4) of 26.32% is correct.
- Utah's actual FFY 2021 Math data for Group B (Grade 8) was 31.27%. Utah's reported Math data for Group B (Grade 8) of 31.84% is correct.

Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2021 data was grade 9 data only. Utah's Group C (Grade HS) FFY 2022 data includes grades 9 and 10. The USBE will be working with stakeholders to reset targets and report the new targets during the clarification period.

3D – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D – OSEP Response

The State has revised the Grade HS Reading and the Grade HS Math baselines for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State revised the Grade HS Reading and the Grade HS Math targets for this indicator, through FFY 2024, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D – Required Actions

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

4A – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

4A – Data Source

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

4A – Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

4A – Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State;
or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A – Indicator Data

4A – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	18.18%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%

4A – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

4A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment

(LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

140

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5	16	18.18%	0.00%	31.25%	Did not meet target	Slippage

4A – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

USBE is taking a more proactive, investigative approach to 4A discrepancies which is resulting in higher identification rates. The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to improve and update the Indicator 4 calculation process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in the calculation method from five percentage points higher than the State rate (which would have made the State bar 5.10% in FFY 2022) to five times the state rate (which makes the State bar 0.52% in FFY 2022) led to an increase in LEAs identified.

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

4A – State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The USBE uses the "State bar" method for identifying significant discrepancy. The FFY 2022 (school year (SY) 2021–2022) State rate for suspending/expelling SWD for more than 10 days was 0.0542%. Across the entire state, 93 SWD were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2021–2022. The USBE set the State bar as five times the State rate, or 0.27% in FFY 2022. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 0.27% or more of its SWD for more than ten days was identified for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 10 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator and a "cell" size of two students in the numerator. Of the 156 LEAs in SY 2021–2022, 28 had SWD who had a cumulative of 10 or more days of out of school suspensions and 128 did not have any. Of the 28 LEAs that had SWD who were suspended more than 10 days, 16 LEAs met the minimum n/cell sizes and 12 LEAs did not.

USBE arrived at the count of 140 LEAs excluded from the calculation through two processes of elimination:

- 128 LEAs were excluded due to not having any students with disabilities suspended more than 10 days (did not meet the minimum cell size).
- 12 LEAs were excluded due to not meeting the combination of minimum n and cell sizes.

The total out of school suspensions/expulsions within an LEA during a school year is calculated by summing up all out of school removals (10% of the day or longer). SWD with > 10 total days of out of school removals are identified. The USBE compares the LEA rate to the State rate. A significant discrepancy occurs when the LEA’s rate equals or exceeds five times the State rate. The target is 0% of LEAs with a significant discrepancy.

As 4A is a results indicator, all LEAs identified for significant discrepancy are included in the numerator regardless of the result of the review of policies, procedures, and practices.

4A – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to improve and update the Indicator 4 process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. The change in the calculation method from five percentage points higher than the State rate (which would have made the State bar 5.10%) to five times the state rate (which makes the State bar 0.52%) led to an increase in LEAs identified. An LEA self-assessment of policies, procedures, and practices regarding suspension and expulsion was conducted on the FFY 2022 data. This process increases the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate. Five LEAs were identified for a significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion in FFY 2022. The process of correction and verification is in process.

OSEP noted that the State's revised methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of students with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States. Although USBE uses a threshold that falls above the median threshold used by all States, the revised methodology is reasonably designed and approved by stakeholders to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities.

4A – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy were required to complete a self-assessment of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices and individual student file reviews regarding discipline procedures taken. The self-assessments were submitted to the USBE for determination of compliance.

The five LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy submitted self-assessments and were all identified as noncompliant. Documentation of manifestation determinations, parent receipt of Procedural Safeguards, and attempts to address student behavior were not documented, and findings of noncompliance were issued.

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:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Written notification of findings of noncompliance were sent to five LEAs on January 16, 2024, requiring student specific correction and evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements due August 16, 2024. Students included in the original review were resent to the LEA to review and ensure the students are provided a free appropriate public education and, if further suspension has occurred, appropriate policies and procedures are followed.

LEAs are required to train staff on policies and procedures regarding procedural safeguards, manifestation determination, and free appropriate public education requirements related to discipline. Training is based on approved special education policies and procedures manuals. Student specific correction and training on updated policies and procedures will be reported in next year's annual performance report.

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

4A – FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

4A – Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Two LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance on January 31, 2023. Each LEA was required to update discipline policies to align with special education and restorative practices outlined in Utah Special Education Rule V. and Utah Administrative Rule R277-609-4.

Each LEA was also required to review suspension/expulsion data in the 2022–2023 school year. Specific SWD were identified, and the LEA ensured procedures outlined in the updated policies were followed and students were provided a free appropriate public education.

Updates to policies were reviewed by USBE and approved. Student reviews were completed correctly, consistent with updated policies, and USBE verified correct implementation of regulatory requirements on September 29, 2023.

4A – Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

Five students were identified in the FFY 2021 data. One student was still enrolled in one LEA at the time the finding was issued. The LEA reviewed the student file and found the student had been suspended in the following school year and that appropriate policies and procedures were followed. The LEA also confirmed the student was provided a free appropriate public education before and during suspension. The USBE verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and closed the finding on September 29, 2023.

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2021 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34c.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a

State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

4A – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Two LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance on January 31, 2023. Each LEA was required to update discipline policies to align with special education and restorative practices outlined in Utah Special Education Rule V. and Utah Administrative Rule R277-609-4.

Each LEA was also required to review suspension/expulsion data in the 2022–2023 school year. Specific SWD were identified, and the LEA ensured procedures outlined in the updated policies were followed and students were provided a free appropriate public education.

Updates to policies were reviewed by USBE and approved. Student reviews were completed correctly, consistent with updated policies, and USBE verified correct implementation of regulatory requirements on September 29, 2023.

Five students were identified in the FFY 2021 data. One student was still enrolled in one LEA at the time the finding was issued. The LEA reviewed the student file and found the student had been suspended in the following school year and that appropriate policies and procedures were followed. The LEA also confirmed that the student was provided a free appropriate public education before and during suspension. The USBE verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected and closed the finding on September 29, 2023.

The USBE uses the "State bar" method for identifying significant discrepancy. The FFY 2022 (school year (SY) 2021–2022) State rate for suspending/expelling SWD for more than 10 days was 0.0542%. Across the entire state, 93 SWD were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2021–2022. The USBE set the State bar as five times the State rate, or 0.27% in FFY 2022. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 0.27% or more of its SWD for more than ten days was identified for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 10 SWD in the LEA in the denominator and a "cell" size of two students in the numerator. Of the 156 LEAs in SY 2021–2022, 28 had SWD who had a cumulative of 10 or more days of out of school suspensions and 128 did not have any. Of the 28 LEAs that had SWD who were suspended more than 10 days, 16 LEAs met the minimum n/cell sizes and 12 LEAs did not.

USBE arrived at the count of 140 LEAs excluded from the calculation through two processes of elimination:

- 128 LEAs were excluded due to not having any SWD suspended more than 10 days (did not meet the minimum cell size).

- 12 LEAs were excluded due to not meeting the combination of minimum N and cell sizes.

The total out of school suspensions/expulsions within an LEA during a school year is calculated by summing up all out of school removals (10% of the day or longer). SWD with > 10 total days of out of school removals are identified. The USBE compares the LEA rate to the State rate. A significant discrepancy occurs when the LEA's rate equals or exceeds five times the State rate. The target is 0% of LEAs with a significant discrepancy.

The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to improve and update the Indicator 4 process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. The change in the calculation method from five percentage points higher than the State rate (which would have made the State bar 5.10%) to five times the state rate (which makes the State bar 0.52%) led to an increase in LEAs identified. An LEA self-assessment of policies, procedures, and practices regarding suspension and expulsion was conducted on the FFY 2022 data. This process increases the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate. Five LEAs were identified for a significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion in FFY 2022. The process of correction and verification is in process.

4A – OSEP Response

OSEP's Required Actions in response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR required the State to explain, in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP appreciates the State reported it reviewed its methodology to determine if it is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's revised methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States.

4A – Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2022 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34c.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

4B – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

4B – Data Source

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

4B – Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

4B – Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race

and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State;
or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing

noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B – Indicator Data

4B – Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

4B – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

4B – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

4B – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

141

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9	7	15	0.00%	0%	46.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

4B – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The USBE is taking a more proactive, investigative approach to 4B discrepancies which is resulting in higher identification rates. The increases from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 are inflated due to FFY 2021 being heavily impacted due to school closures and fewer students attending in person, thus fewer students were involved in incidents and receiving disciplines.

The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to improve and update the Indicator 4 process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in the calculation method from five percentage points higher than the State rate (which would have made the State bar 5.10%) to five times the state rate (which makes the State bar 0.52%) led to an increase in LEAs identified.

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

4B – State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The USBE uses the "State bar" method for identifying significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity. The FFY 2022 (school year (SY) 2021–2022) State rate for suspending/expelling SWD for more than 10 days was 0.0542%. Across the entire state, 93 SWD were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2021-2022. The USBE set the State bar as five times the State rate, or 0.27% in FFY 2022. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 0.27% or more of its SWD for more than ten days was identified for significant discrepancy. There must be a “cell” size of two students in the numerator of the target race/ethnicity in the LEA who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 days and an "n" size of at least 10 SWD in the denominator of the target race/ethnicity in the LEA. Of the 156 LEAs in SY 2021-2022, 28 had SWD who had a cumulative of 10 or more days of out of school suspensions and 128 did not have any. Of the 28 LEAs that had SWD who were suspended more than 10 days, 15 LEAs met the minimum n/cell sizes and 13 LEAs did not.

USBE arrived at the count of 141 LEAs excluded from the calculation through two processes of elimination:

- 128 LEAs were excluded due to not having any SWD suspended more than 10 days (did not meet the minimum cell size).
- 13 LEAs were excluded due to not meeting the combination of minimum N and cell sizes.

The total out of school suspensions/expulsions within an LEA during a school year is calculated by summing up all out of school removals (10% of the day or longer). SWD with > 10 total days of out of school removals are identified. The USBE compares the LEA rate to the State rate. A significant discrepancy occurs when the LEA's rate equals or exceeds five times the State rate. The target is 0% of LEAs with a significant discrepancy.

4B – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE worked directly with the IDC to improve and update the Indicator 4 calculation process (including adjusting the State bar) in FFY 2021. The change in process required a revised baseline, as noted in the baseline section of data table, for consistency with the updated method. An LEA self-assessment of policies, procedures, and practices regarding suspension and expulsion was conducted on the FFY 2022 data. This process increases the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate. Seven LEAs were identified for significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in FFY 2022. Therefore, the State did not meet target. Races/ethnicities identified included Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, White, and Multiple Races. Hispanic/Latino had the highest identification in five of the seven LEAs.

The USBE previously used a three-week window for correction before issuing findings of noncompliance. This is no longer a part of our policies, procedures, or practices. Written findings of noncompliance are issued for all areas below 100% compliance upon identification.

OSEP noted that the State's revised methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of students with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States. Although USBE uses a threshold that falls above the median threshold used by all States, the revised methodology is reasonably designed and approved by stakeholders to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities.

4B – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

Seven LEAs were identified with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in FFY 2022. The identified LEAs were required to conduct a self-assessment review of the LEA's discipline policies and procedures, as well as a review of individual student files regarding practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and the Procedural Safeguards. The self-assessments were submitted to the USBE for determination of compliance, the need for correction, and verification of implementation of regulatory requirements.

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:

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Written findings of noncompliance were sent to seven LEAs on January 16, 2024, requiring student specific correction and evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements due August 16, 2024. Students included in the original review were resent to the LEA to review and ensure the students are provided a free appropriate public education and, if further suspension has occurred, appropriate policies and procedures are followed.

LEAs are required to train staff on policies and procedures regarding the Procedural Safeguards, manifestation determination, and free appropriate public education requirements related to discipline. Training is based on approved special education policies and procedures manuals. Student specific correction and training on updated policies and procedures will be reported in next year's annual performance report.

4B – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

4B – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

4B – Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, under the State's chosen methodology; and how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

4B – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The USBE uses the "State bar" method for identifying significant discrepancy. The FFY 2022 (school year (SY) 2021–2022) State rate for suspending/expelling SWD for more than 10 days was 0.0542%. Across the entire state, 93 SWD were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2021-2022. The USBE set the State bar as five times the State rate, or 0.27% in FFY 2022. Any LEA that suspended or expelled 0.27% or more of its SWD for more than ten days was identified for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 10 SWD in the LEA in the denominator and a "cell" size of two students in the numerator. Of the 156 LEAs in SY 2021-2022, 28 had SWD who had a cumulative of 10 or more days of out of school suspensions and 128 did not have any. Of the 28 LEAs that had SWD who were suspended more than 10 days, 16 LEAs met the minimum n/cell sizes and 12 LEAs did not.

USBE arrived at the count of 140 LEAs excluded from the calculation through two processes of elimination:

- 128 LEAs were excluded due to not having any SWD suspended more than 10 days (did not meet the minimum cell size).
- 12 LEAs were excluded due to not meeting the combination of minimum N and cell sizes.

The total out of school suspensions/expulsions within an LEA during a school year is calculated by summing up all out of school removals (10% of the day or longer). SWD with > 10 total days of out of school removals are identified. The USBE compares the LEA rate to the State rate. A significant discrepancy occurs when the LEA's rate equals or exceeds five times the State rate. The target is 0% of LEAs with a significant discrepancy.

The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to improve and update the Indicator 4 process (including adjusting the State bar). The change in process required a revised baseline for consistency with the updated method. The change in the calculation method from five percentage points higher than the State rate (which would have made the State bar 5.10%) to five times the state rate (which makes the State bar 0.52%) led to an increase in LEAs identified. An LEA self-assessment of policies, procedures, and practices regarding suspension and expulsion was conducted on the FFY 2022 data. This process increases the ability to identify and issue findings of noncompliance where appropriate. Five LEAs were identified for a significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion in FFY 2022. The process of correction and verification is in process.

4B – OSEP Response

OSEP's Required Actions in response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR required the State to explain, in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP appreciates the State reported it reviewed its methodology to determine if it is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's revised methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States. Additionally, OSEP

notes that the State's revised methodology included very low percentage of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion, by race or ethnicity, of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

4B – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) – 21)

5 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

5 – Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

5 – Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class } 80\% \text{ or more of the day}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs})] \times 100.$
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than } 40\% \text{ of the day}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs})] \times 100.$
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs})] \times 100.$

5 – Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 – Indicator Data

5 – Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2018	Target >=	58.53%	58.97%	59.41%	65.12%	65.12%
A	65.12%	Data	63.47%	65.12%	67.84%	70.54%	72.13%
B	2018	Target <=	13.29%	13.22%	13.15%	9.71%	9.71%
B	9.71%	Data	10.26%	9.71%	9.13%	8.43%	8.44%
C	2018	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.78%	2.78%
C	2.67%	Data	2.63%	2.67%	2.58%	2.68%	2.54%

5 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	65.79%	66.47%	67.81%	70.50%
Target B <=	9.43%	9.16%	8.61%	7.50%
Target C <=	2.77%	2.75%	2.68%	2.65%

5 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

5 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	84,143
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61,930
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,178
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,885

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	18
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	73

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

5 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61,930	84,143	72.13%	65.79%	73.60%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,178	84,143	8.44%	9.43%	8.53%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,976	84,143	2.54%	2.77%	2.35%	Met target	No Slippage

5 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

5 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 – OSEP Response

None

5 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

6 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

6 – Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

6 – Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}}{\text{total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.

6 – Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

6 – Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

6 – Historical Data (Inclusive): 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	33.82%	36.32%	36.52%	46.86%	46.86%
A	Data	39.90%	48.09%	52.05%	50.69%	50.73%
B	Target <=	42.96%	41.35%	41.15%	32.67%	32.67%
B	Data	34.68%	28.50%	29.76%	31.14%	31.66%
C	Target <=				0.31%	0.31%
C	Data				0.31%	0.27%

6 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

6 – Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

6 – Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	46.86%
B	2018	32.67%
C	2018	0.25%

6 – Inclusive Targets: 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	47.75%	48.65%	50.43%	54.00%
Target B <=	32.34%	32.00%	31.34%	30.00%

6 – Inclusive Targets: 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.30%	0.29%	0.28%	0.24%

6 – Prepopulated Data

6 – Data Source

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

6 – Date

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,793	3,754	1,025	7,572
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	1,245	1,915	548	3,708
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	957	1,063	263	2,283
b2. Number of children attending separate school	56	49	10	115
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	3	6	2	11

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

6 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,708	7,572	50.73%	47.75%	48.97%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,398	7,572	31.66%	32.34%	31.67%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	11	7,572	0.27%	0.30%	0.15%	Met target	No Slippage

6 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

6 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 – OSEP Response

None

6 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

7 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

7 – Data Source

State selected data source.

7 – Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

7 – Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

7 – Instructions

Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

7 – Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

7 – Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2018	Target >=	91.32%	95.10%	95.30%	88.86%	88.86%
A1	88.86%	Data	89.28%	88.86%	89.18%	91.49%	87.12%
A2	2018	Target >=	52.00%	52.93%	53.13%	55.80%	55.80%
A2	58.94%	Data	61.26%	58.94%	57.20%	57.83%	49.20%
B1	2018	Target >=	90.76%	93.21%	93.41%	88.41%	88.41%
B1	88.41%	Data	88.34%	88.41%	90.04%	92.26%	89.09%
B2	2018	Target >=	45.59%	48.71%	48.91%	48.48%	48.48%
B2	50.48%	Data	53.64%	50.48%	48.70%	49.86%	39.48%
C1	2018	Target >=	91.50%	93.92%	94.12%	89.86%	89.86%
C1	86.86%	Data	90.83%	89.86%	89.68%	92.23%	86.43%
C2	2018	Target >=	63.77%	67.21%	67.41%	66.44%	66.44%
C2	70.52%	Data	71.68%	70.52%	66.95%	68.44%	53.78%

7 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	88.94%	89.02%	89.18%	89.50%
Target A2 >=	56.33%	56.85%	57.90%	60.00%
Target B1 >=	88.73%	89.06%	89.71%	91.00%
Target B2 >=	48.80%	49.11%	49.74%	51.00%
Target C1 >=	90.00%	90.15%	90.43%	91.00%
Target C2 >=	67.01%	67.58%	68.72%	71.00%

7 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)

- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah's participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

7 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

7 – Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,555

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	10	0.28%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	343	9.65%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,450	40.79%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,475	41.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	277	7.79%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,925	3,278	87.12%	88.94%	89.23%	Met target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,752	3,555	49.20%	56.33%	49.28%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	0.39%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	287	8.07%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,813	51.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,352	38.03%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	89	2.50%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,165	3,466	89.09%	88.73%	91.32%	Met target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,441	3,555	39.48%	48.80%	40.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

7 – Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15	0.42%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	319	8.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,315	36.99%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,617	45.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	289	8.13%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,932	3,266	86.43%	90.00%	89.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,906	3,555	53.78%	67.01%	53.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

Data is collected in the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) online program. LEAs and the USBE can generate reports on the compliance data collected. These data and reports are used in the UPIPS onsite monitoring process and the APR. Within UPIPS is a section titled Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) for collecting Indicator 7 early childhood outcomes data. Teachers collect and enter entry and exit outcome scores, along with the name of the assessment tool utilized, into UPOD when a student enters preschool and when the student exits preschool services, such as when the student transitions from preschool to kindergarten. The LEA report section provides LEA-specific Part B early childhood outcomes data and overall statewide data with "n" sizes and percentages transferred to the APR.

7 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

7 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 – OSEP Response

None

7 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

8 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

8 – Data Source

State selected data source.

8 – Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

8 – Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 – Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

8 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with

USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

8 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	78.38%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	79.62%	80.52%	81.33%	78.38%	78.38%
Data	79.65%	78.38%	78.84%	78.56%	80.10%

8 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.58%	78.79%	79.19%	80.00%

8 – FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,324	1,713	80.10%	78.58%	77.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage

8 – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

While slippage in FFY 2020 was attributed to the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and how communication and special education services were administered, slippage during this survey cycle is in part due to the configuration of LEAs that were selected for FFY 2022 as part of the sampling plan. COVID-19 also required target goals to be adjusted as LEAs recovered from the pandemic.

The State does not survey each LEA every year. The four largest LEAs are in the sample each year, and the remaining LEAs are divided into two cohorts. While each year's sample is representative of the State in terms of demographics, one group of LEAs may not facilitate involvement to the extent the other group does. The last time this group of LEAs was surveyed (FFY 2020), their rate was 78.57%; this year, their rate is 77.29% which does represent a decrease. The USBE examined whether the decrease was specific to particular LEAs. A spreadsheet showing which LEAs had the largest/smallest difference in their parent involvement rates has been created to determine if any follow-up is warranted. Regarding the four largest LEAs which are surveyed every year, two of them saw a decrease in their parent involvement scores between 2021–22 and 2022–23. Each LEA gets a report of their results over time so they can quickly see if their parent involvement rate has decreased/increased/stayed the same. The USBE also examined the difference in response rates between last year and this year. The response rate is lower this year than it has been in the last three years. This decrease may have had an impact on the parent involvement rate.

In addition, the USBE drilled down to the item level to see if there are items that showed more slippage than others. Two survey items saw an increase in the percentage of parents who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement provided, whereas 10 survey items saw a decrease in those percentages. These 10 items decreased on average 2 percentage points from 2021–22 to 2022–23.

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.

LEAs provide the USBE with contact information for all SWD enrolled in the LEAs. The parent survey sample is based on the number of SWD enrolled in the LEA. Parents who receive the survey are based on a statistical sampling of the LEA. The contact information provided by the

LEA is sorted based on student grade, environment code, and disability category. The sorted data is used to gather a representative sample of the LEA. The student data sorting procedure ensures parents from all student groups are represented in the sample. All parents receive the same survey. Parents do not report whether their student is a preschool or a school age student. Survey collection procedures ensure both preschool and school age students are represented in an equitable way. Please refer to the “Sampling Question” section below for additional discussion on how the USBE’s data collection procedures ensure equitable representation among preschool and school age students. Once the surveys are completed for all LEAs in the survey sample, the data is aggregated to determine the State rate for Indicator 8. The USBE uses the expertise of a statistician to aggregate the data and increase the validity and reliability of the data.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

7,610

Percentage of respondent parents.

22.51%

8 – Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	25.68%	22.51%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The USBE used the metric of +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The USBE compared the representation by race/ethnicity and primary disability in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over- or under-representation.

Using this methodology, no differences were found by grade group. Differences were found by race/ethnicity. The SWD population consists of 69% White students and 21% Hispanics students; the respondents consist of 80% White and 12% Hispanic. All other racial/ethnic groups were within 3% of their population.

Although there are a few significant differences in response rates between groups of parents by race/ethnicity, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage itself between these groups of parents. For example, parents of White students and Hispanic students had similar parent involvement percentages to the other racial/ethnic groups. Furthermore,

parents from a wide range of LEAs from across the state responded to the survey. Despite this, the overall results are not representative of the State due to the differences in the racial/ethnic representation between the population and respondents.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The USBE is taking steps to encourage more responses. To increase access to the survey, the USBE has a third party translate the survey and accompanying introduction letter to ensure the letter provided to families is the most updated version. The Indicator 8 survey has previously been translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, Tongan, Farsi, Arabic, and Somali – the most common languages spoken in the state beyond English and Spanish. The State is currently also looking at having the survey translated into Navajo after review of survey responses indicated a low response rate for this demographic. The USBE will also be conducting a yearly assessment of language needs in the State to ensure the most common languages are represented with every survey cycle. One LEA also requested translation of the survey into Marshallese as several parents in the LEA speak Marshallese as a primary language. This was approved and completed.

This is the third year the survey had a digital option for families who provided an email address and whose primary language was English and/or Spanish. LEAs stated the digital survey provided additional access to families, contributing to an increase in returned surveys in both English and Spanish. Surveys are administered via electronic and paper surveys. During the final mailing of paper surveys, staff at the USBE also call families at LEAs who have not met their response rate goal to provide the option to complete the survey over the phone.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The USBE Family and Community Engagement Specialist has and will continue to meet with LEAs who are identified with high risk for the Indicator 8 survey. After meeting with the LEAs during the Spring of 2023, the USBE found common themes during these meetings of responses that impacted the LEAs' positive response rates. These themes included:

- (1)lack of awareness on behalf of LEAs due to staff turnover which then rippled into awareness on behalf of families about the survey;
- (2)lack of access for families to be able to complete the survey due to technology or reading literacy limitations;
- (3)a need to build LEA skills in supporting diverse families; and
- (4)a misconception regarding the intention of the Indicator 8 survey, as well as the way the information received will be used by the USBE and, in turn, shared with the LEA.

These needs have informed the work conducted to help promote the completion of the Indicator 8 survey.

In its efforts to encourage more responses, the USBE has established an Indicator 8 hotline. This hotline serves three purposes:

- (1) Provide families with a phone number they can save in their phones and recognize when the USBE calls to ask if they would like to complete the survey via a phone call. This effort helped the USBE receive responses from a secondary school that historically has had zero responses. The LEA met its target response goal.
- (2) Provide the opportunity for families to call the USBE to complete the survey over the phone.
- (3) Provide the opportunity for families to call and ask questions about the intent behind this survey, how results are used, and clarify misconceptions surrounding the survey. For example, a parent called because they were under the impression the survey was a punitive action on behalf of the state. They wanted to advocate for their LEA and were hesitant to complete the survey because they did not want their response to further penalize the LEA.

In alignment with the creation of a phone number that can be saved and recognized by families, the Indicator 8 electronic survey will now be administered from a specific Indicator 8 email address. The email address and hotline number will be provided with the parent letter notifying families of the survey administration. Families will be notified of the survey administration method so they are aware of what to look for via phone calls, email including junk folders, and in their physical mailbox. Instructions on how to ensure their response is received will also be included. In addition, a fact sheet will be included explaining how their feedback helps guide the level of support, resources, or programs the state can offer LEAs.

The Utah State Board of Education is researching the logistical requirements of a state short message service (SMS) system that will administer the survey via text messages. Text messages are evidenced to have higher rates of engagement for families.

LEAs will also participate in promoting an increased response rate by working with the USBE to align their school improvement plans to include usage of the Indicator 8 data and strategies and other school improvement initiatives that will include ongoing feedback loops, CALL Survey protocol, and all other relevant USBE programs that are participating in that will promote family participation through the ongoing practicing of families providing input throughout the year.

The USBE is working to support LEAs in the process of increasing their individual response rates. This includes meeting on specific improvement plans informed by their survey response data including parent comments. LEAs will also be receiving a social media toolkit to assist with promoting awareness on what the Indicator 8 survey is, how information is used and shared, and highlighting the significance the survey has on the education of students in the State.

The USBE works proactively with families, organizations, and LEAs to provide TA and support to ensure parents are involved in their student's education and LEAs are compliant with parental involvement/engagement as outlined in the IDEA. The USBE's monitoring process (UPIPS) has emphasized parent engagement through student focus groups and focused parent engagement questions in interviews with educators, administrators, and related service providers. LEAs are provided verbal and written feedback and recommendations for improving parent involvement as part of the monitoring process.

To increase access to the survey, the USBE had a third party translate the survey and accompanying introduction letter into Vietnamese, Tongan, Farsi, Arabic, and Somali – the most common languages spoken in the state beyond English and Spanish. A reevaluation of language needs in the state will be conducted and additional translations will be provided as needed.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

In accordance with the State's data privacy policies and procedures, LEAs provide the USBE with contact information for all SWD enrolled in the LEA. For secure data sharing, LEAs and the USBE utilize the Utah Schools Information Management System (USIMS). LEAs are instructed to download a list of students generated by the USBE and crosscheck to ensure all the information is correct. LEAs also have an option to include any notes the State might consider in the survey administration process. For example, the USBE learned about a student death via these notes and decided to not include that student's family in the sample.

A new sampling plan was instituted in 2014–15 by the USBE and was approved by OSEP. For each LEA, a stratified, representative group of parents is selected to receive the parent survey. The number of parents chosen is dependent on the number of SWD in the LEA. The sample sizes selected ensure roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes. Each year, a list of students with IEPs as of December 1 of the school year is generated and provided to the USBE contracted statistician to produce a sample list and prepare for surveying and compiling results. The data source is the current year data after the December submission has been approved (approximately the third week of December).

Parents who receive the survey are based on a statistical sampling of the LEA. The contact information provided by the LEA is sorted based on student grade, environment code, and disability category. The sorted data is used to gather a representative sample of the LEA. The student data sorting procedure ensures parents from all student groups are represented in the sample. All parents receive the same survey. Parents do not report whether their student is a preschool or a school-age student. Survey collection procedures ensure both preschool and school-age students are represented equitably. A representative group of LEAs was chosen for the two survey years. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. When pulling data for LEAs, staff always include LEA name, district number, school name, school number, student's name, SSID, and contact information including phone number, mailing/physical address, and language spoken at home.

The Indicator 8 team confirms timelines for the data pull and delivery, reviews the list of LEAs to sample for the school year based on a count of PK-12 students enrolled on October 1 using data from the Utah eTranscript and Record Exchange (UTREx) submission, runs a query every year to confirm the LEAs that meet these criteria (when a new LEA opens, their second year of operation will be the first year they are surveyed), runs a query to select each qualifying student's enrollment record and associated SCRAM record.

LEAs participate in the Indicator 8 data collection process every other year. This allows for each LEA to receive results on its parents in a timely manner and to determine how improvement activities they implement are impacting parent involvement specific to parents whose students receive special education service in Utah’s public schools; it also ensures the state results are representative of the state. Once the surveys are completed for all LEAs in the survey sample, the data is aggregated to determine the State rate for Indicator 8. The USBE uses the expertise of a statistician to aggregate the data and increase the validity and reliability of the data.

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias. One is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. Our response rate is 23%, which is high. It is possible that those parents who did not respond are different in some meaningful way in their level of positivity from those who did respond. Thus, we proceeded with the next two ways for examining nonresponse bias.

- First, the representativeness of the responses can be examined. Although significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed no significant differences in the overall parent involvement percentage.
- Second, we compare the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no statistically significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later. Therefore, we conclude that nonresponse bias is not present.

Utah used +/- 3% criteria to determine if one demographic group was over- or under-represented based on their response rate. Although significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and disability, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed no significant differences in the overall parent involvement percentage. The stratified, random sample method plays a crucial role in this by taking the student list at the LEA level and using the sampling selection to ensure bias is not present.

USBE is making the previously mentioned efforts to increase representation by providing strategies and support to increase responses from groups with lower survey response rates.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving the parent survey on a biennial basis. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive the survey every year. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. LEAs across the stratified categories were then

randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. Each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs.

For each LEA, a stratified, representative group of parents is selected to receive the parent survey. The number of parents chosen is dependent on the number of SWD in the LEA. The sample sizes selected ensure roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes.

For those LEAs that have more than 100 SWD, a sample of parents was chosen to receive the survey. The population was stratified by grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample.

When calculating state-level results, responses are weighted by the student population size (e.g., an LEA that had four times as many SWD as another LEA received four times the weight in computing overall state results).

The parent survey is based on a Likert scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The maximum rating is 100% when a parent responds “strongly agree” on all questions. A 67% rating is when a parent responds “agree” on all questions, a 33% rating is when a parent responds “disagree” on all questions, and a 0% rating is when a parent responds “strongly disagree” on all questions. If a parent survey rating is 67% or higher, the survey has met the minimum threshold for Indicator 8. If a parent responds “strongly disagree” on any item, the survey has not met the indicator requirements.

The USBE sends via U.S. mail or email a survey introduction letter, a survey, and a business reply envelope (for parents to submit completed mailed surveys) to every parent on the LEA’s determined sample list. Surveys are expected to be returned within one month. Any parents who have not returned the surveys within the first month are provided bi-weekly reminders and are offered additional options for responding to the survey until the LEA reaches the desired response rate or until the survey closes.

The USBE made the survey available in a digital format for the fourth time this year. The digital version of the survey was sent out to all parents who provided their email addresses and whose primary language was Spanish and/or English. Digital surveys were completed through Qualtrics which produced a spreadsheet of parent answers.

Completed paper surveys were scanned and processed with an Optical Mark Reader (OMR) software program. The software program helps eliminate human error during the scoring process. The program produces a spreadsheet of the parent responses. The OMR and Qualtrics survey data are merged into one spreadsheet which is securely provided to the USBE’s statistician who produces the state report.

The USBE is continually working to increase efforts to engage responses from parents in the Hispanic and Pacific Islander communities. Additional analysis and investigation into students and parents who are African American/Black will help identify strategies to increase participation from this community as well.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	N/A

8 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

8 – Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

8 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

None

8 – OSEP Response

None

8 – Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

9 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

9 – Data Source

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

9 – Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

9 – Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 – Indicator Data

9 – Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

9 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	1.44%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%	1.44%

9 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

9 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

14

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	143	1.44%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation is a weighted risk ratio of 3.00 or above. One year of data is used for this calculation. For all analysis group and comparison group calculations, the minimum cell size (the numerator) is 5, and the minimum n-size (the denominator) is 10.

Using school year (SY) 2022–2023 data, the USBE calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group in each LEA in the State based on the identification rates in each of 157 LEAs. Of these 157 LEAs, 143 met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final weighted risk ratio. If an LEA's weighted risk ratio exceeded the 3.00 threshold for racial/ethnic groups that had five or more SWD (cell size) and 10 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA with the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups combined) also having five or

more SWD (cell size) and 10 or more total students enrolled (n-size) in the LEA, the LEA was flagged for disproportionate representation.

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

All LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation are required to complete a self-assessment to determine if the disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification. This includes a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to referral, evaluation, and eligibility determination, as well as individual student file reviews regarding evaluation and eligibility determination measures taken for students in the flagged group(s). The USBE determines an LEA has disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification when any level of noncompliance is identified by the USBE during the review of the LEA's self-assessment.

Two LEAs were flagged for disproportionate representation in FFY 2022. Upon review of their self-assessments and student files, no noncompliance was identified for either LEA. Therefore, the USBE determined no LEAs had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

9 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2022 data chart reports no districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups as a result of inappropriate identification. No findings were issued to the two districts identified because students were appropriately identified under approved LEA policies, procedures, and practices.

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

9 – FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Upon issuing written notification of findings of noncompliance, the USBE required the two LEAs with noncompliance to submit an additional student file not already reviewed in the self-assessment process to verify correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs with a pattern of noncompliance received required PL related to the pattern area. The USBE reviewed each additional student file and verified correction (100% compliance) through a desk audit. The two LEAs were notified upon verification of correction. The two LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 completed all the state's requirements and were verified as correctly implementing the regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

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

Upon issuing written notification of findings of noncompliance, the USBE required the two LEAs with noncompliance to submit corrected files for each individual case of noncompliance or submit information that the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The USBE reviewed each individual student file through a desk audit and if noncompliance was still present, the USBE gave the LEA individual TA. The LEA was required to correct any remaining noncompliance and submit the corrections to the USBE for review. Through this process, the USBE verified 100% correction through a desk audit for the two LEAs who had noncompliance. The two LEAs were notified upon verification of correction. The two LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 completed all the state’s requirements and were verified as having corrected (100% compliance) each individual case of noncompliance.

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

9 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the two districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34c.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

9 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

To verify the two LEAs identified with disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the USBE required the LEAs to submit an additional student file not already reviewed in the self-

assessment. LEAs who had a pattern of noncompliance also had required PL related to the pattern area. The USBE reviewed each additional student file and verified correction (100% compliance) through a desk audit. The two LEAs were notified upon verification of correction. The two LEAs with noncompliance in FFY2021 completed all the state's requirements and were verified as correctly implementing the regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

To verify the two LEAs identified with disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, the USBE required the LEAs to submit corrected files for each identified student or submit information that the student was no longer within the jurisdiction in the LEA. The USBE reviewed each updated individual student file through a desk audit. If noncompliance was still present, the USBE provided the LEA with individual TA. The LEA was required to correct any remaining noncompliance and submit the corrections to the USBE for review. Through this process, the USBE verified 100% correction. The LEAs were notified upon verification of correction. The two LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 completed all the state's requirements and were verified as having corrected (100% compliance) each individual case of noncompliance.

9 – OSEP Response

None

9 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

10 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

10 – Data Source

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

10 – Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

10 – Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for

children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 – Indicator Data

10 – Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

10 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	5.69%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%	5.69%

10 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

10 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

36

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
27	6	121	5.69%	0%	4.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation is a weighted risk ratio of 3.00 or above. One year of data is used for this calculation. For all analysis group and comparison group calculations, the minimum cell size (the numerator) is five, and the minimum n-size (the denominator) is 10.

Using school year (SY) 2022–2023 data, the USBE calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group and disability category combination in each LEA in the State based on the identification rates in each of 157 LEAs. 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. However, 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.

Of the 157 LEAs in Utah in SY 2022–2023, 121 met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final weighted risk ratio. If an LEA's weighted risk ratio exceeded the 3.00 threshold for a target racial/ethnic group that had five or more students in a specific disability category (cell size) and 10 or more SWD of the target racial/ethnic group enrolled (n-size) in the LEA with the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups in the specific disability category) also having five or more students (cell size) and 10 or more total students of the target racial/ethnic group enrolled (n-size) in the LEA, the LEA was flagged for disproportionate representation.

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

All LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation were required to complete a pilot self-assessment to determine if the disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification. This included a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to referral, evaluation, and eligibility determination, as well as individual student file reviews regarding evaluation and eligibility determination measures taken for students in the flagged combination(s). LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification when any level of noncompliance was identified by the USBE during the review of the LEA self-assessments

10 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The LEAs determined to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification were also issued written findings of noncompliance. The findings identified the specific area(s) of noncompliance and provided corresponding regulation. The LEAs were required to revise policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the development and implementation of eligibility and IEP documents. Within one year of identification, all corrections will be verified through individual student file reviews to ensure 100% compliance. To determine whether the LEAs are subsequently implementing regulatory requirements, the USBE will review each individual case of noncompliance in student files and will provide training as necessary.

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

10 – FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2021, Upon issuing a written notification of findings, the USBE required the seven LEAs with noncompliance to submit an additional student file through the state data system. The LEAs were asked to provide a file for a student not already reviewed in the self-assessment. LEAs who had a pattern of noncompliance also had required PL related to the pattern area. The USBE reviewed each additional student file. If the file was not compliant, the LEA was given individual TA and was required to correct the noncompliance. Based on the review of the additional file submitted through the state data system, as well as through any additional PL provided, the USBE verified each of the seven LEAs is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. The seven LEAs were notified upon verification of correction.

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

Upon issuing written notification of findings of noncompliance, the USBE required the seven LEAs to submit corrected files for each individual case of noncompliance or submit information that the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. USBE reviewed each individual student file through a desk audit and, if noncompliance was still present, the USBE gave the LEA individual TA. The LEA was required to correct any remaining noncompliance and submit the corrections to USBE for review. Through this process, USBE verified 100% correction through a desk audit for the seven LEAs who had noncompliance. The seven LEAs were notified upon verification of correction. The seven LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 completed all the state's requirements and were verified as having corrected each individual case of noncompliance.

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

10 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the seven districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34c.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

10 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The USBE verified correction of the findings for each of the seven LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The USBE verified that each of the seven LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data through data subsequently collected through the State data system. Specifically, to verify the seven LEAs identified with disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the USBE required the LEAs to submit an additional student file, correctly implementing regulatory requirements, not already reviewed in the self-assessment. LEAs who had a pattern of noncompliance related to inappropriate identification were required to conduct professional learning related to the area of inappropriate identification. The USBE reviewed each additional student file and verified correction (100% compliance) through a desk audit. The seven LEAs were notified upon verification of correction.

To verify the seven LEAs identified with disproportionate representation as the result of inappropriate identification have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, the USBE required the LEAs to submit corrected files for each identified student or submit information that the student was no longer within the jurisdiction in the LEA. The USBE reviewed each updated individual student file through a desk audit. If noncompliance was still present, the USBE provided the LEA with individual TA. The LEA was required to correct any remaining noncompliance and submit the corrections to the USBE for review. Through this process, the USBE verified 100% correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The LEAs were notified upon verification of correction. The seven LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 completed all the

state's requirements and were verified as having corrected each individual case of noncompliance.

10 – OSEP Response

None

10 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the six districts identified in FFY 2022 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34c.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 11: Child Find

11 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

11 – Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

11 – Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

11 – Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on

the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 – Indicator Data

11 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	96.21%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	96.21%	97.10%	97.44%	96.24%

11 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

11 – FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
684	621	96.24%	100%	90.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

11 – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The FFY 2021 SPP/APR primarily used the date consent for evaluation was received and the date the last evaluation was completed. During the file reviews, the USBE identified a trend where LEAs had items marked on the consent that were not evaluated after the date consent was received. This was primarily correlated with vision and hearing screeners that were marked on consent but then were never completed because the teams pulled the data from the screeners forward. To comply with a timeline, all consented evaluations needed to be completed within 45 school days from the date consent was received. LEAs were officially notified in February 2022 that starting in FFY 2022, noncompliance would automatically be identified for initial evaluations

when areas marked on the consent were not completed after the date consent was received. The slippage in FFY 2022 is the direct result of changes in how the initial evaluations are monitored.

There is a substantial relationship between compliance with obtaining consent and compliance with the initial evaluation timelines. Any student file that obtained consent for areas not evaluated after the date consent was received was automatically triggered as noncompliant for the initial evaluation timeline.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b).

63

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.

The 63 students whose evaluations were not completed with the State-established 45-school-day timeline were distributed across 30 LEAs. The number of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed ranged from 46 days to 255, with an average of 52 days. There was one evaluation that extended 255 days beyond the timeline. Consent was received in the fall of 2020. Fourteen of the evaluations that went over the timeline did not have any specific documentation to explain why.

The timeline was automatically marked out of range in 49 of the 63 files because there were areas marked on the consent that were not evaluated after the date consent was received. One of those 49 files had inappropriately completed all the evaluations before obtaining consent. Noncompliance identified for the timeline reflects noncompliance related to obtaining consent and completing evaluations.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

USBE Special Education II.D. establishes the initial evaluation must be conducted within 45 school days of receiving parental or student who is an adult consent for evaluation. There are four exceptions to the initial timeline evaluation.

- a. The parent of a student repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the student for the evaluation; or
- b. The student who is an adult repeatedly fails or refuses to participate in evaluation activities; or
- c. A student enrolls in a school served by the LEA after the relevant timeframe has begun, and prior to a determination by the student's previous LEA as to whether the student is a student with a disability.
- d. The exception in these Rules II.D.3.c. applies only if the subsequent LEA is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent or student who is an adult and subsequent LEA agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

One evaluation met the exception requirement of "parent repeatedly fails to produce the student for evaluation." This file was marked as compliant under the exception.

Utah Special Education Rule II.J.11.c.(3) specifies the LEA "must adhere to the 45-school day evaluation timeframe, unless extended by mutual written agreement of the student's parent . . . and a group of qualified professionals." There was one file that had a mutual written agreement to extend the timeframe so the parent could take a little more time to complete a parent rating scale. This file was marked as compliant under this exception.

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

State monitoring

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 for Indicator 11 were collected through full monitoring visits and Indicator 11 monitoring visits focused on reviewing files for initial evaluation compliance. All data were entered in the UPIPS online program. All LEAs will receive a full monitoring visit at least once every six years. LEAs selected for full monitoring visits will be prioritized based on a variety of concerns related to general supervision systems (e.g., concerns with 1%, dispute resolution, Indicator 11 and 13 monitoring, Public Education Hotline complaints, fiscal). Full monitoring visits occur onsite at the LEA and include a review of entire student special education files selected by the USBE. The number of files selected for a full monitoring review is based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and may include a small number of initial evaluations. The total number of files reviewed during full monitoring visits varies based on the size of the LEAs reviewed each year. During the visit, the LEA is encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive TA during the review process. All Indicator 11 data that come from a full monitoring visit are included in the SPP/APR.

Most of the Indicator 11 data are collected during Indicator 11 monitoring visits. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving an Indicator 11 file review biennially. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive an Indicator 11 file monitoring visit annually. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. LEAs across the stratified categories were then randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. The USBE statistician helps compile the cohort list of LEAs to ensure each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs. The rotation for the Indicator 11 review is on an alternating schedule with the Indicator 8 parent survey. In even/odd years, the first cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey, the second cohort receives an Indicator 11 monitoring visit. In odd/even years, the first cohort receives an Indicator 11 monitoring visit, the second cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey. If an LEA is selected for a full monitoring visit the same year its cohort is selected for an Indicator 11 monitoring visit, Indicator 11 will be collected during the full monitoring visit. The LEA will not receive a separate Indicator 11 monitoring visit. During an indicator monitoring review, the USBE reviews up to 10 initial evaluation timelines for all LEAs regardless of the size of the LEA. The LEA selects which files are reviewed by USBE. Indicator file reviews are conducted virtually with the LEA screen sharing while a USBE reviewer collects the data for Indicator 11.

11 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

11 – FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2021, the USBE permitted pre-finding correction for the noncompliance identified. The USBE reviewed the evidence submitted by LEAs in the state data system of correction of each individual case of noncompliance as described below. The LEAs for which the USBE determined had corrected each individual case of noncompliance were also determined by the USBE to be implementing the regulatory requirements. During the pre-finding correction window, all but one LEA provided evidence of correction of each individual case of noncompliance and was issued findings of noncompliance. This LEA was required to submit an additional student file through the state data system showing consent and evaluations that were completed within the State-established 45-school day timeline. The USBE reviewed the additional file submitted and determined the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

In FFY 2021, Utah permitted pre-finding correction for the noncompliance identified. To show correction of each individual case of noncompliance, all LEAs for which noncompliance was identified were required to ensure students found eligible outside the 45-school-day timeline were provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE) and submit evidence through the state data system. The USBE reviewed the evidence submitted by the LEAs and verified correction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. One LEA did not submit evidence of correction during the pre-finding correction window and was issued findings of noncompliance. This LEA submitted evidence through the state data system that it ensured students found eligible outside the 45-school-day timeline were provided a FAPE. The USBE reviewed the evidence submitted by this LEA and verified correction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

11 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

11 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Prior to FFY 2022, the USBE determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance when they did not correct the individual noncompliance within the State-established correction window. All individual noncompliance was corrected by showing an additional student file with consent and evaluations to ensure the evaluations were completed within the State-established 45-school day timeline. For LEAs who were issued findings of noncompliance, additional files were also provided by the LEA and verified by the USBE as compliant to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. All noncompliance from FFY 2021 and prior were corrected using this process and were verified within 10 months from the date noncompliance was identified. The USBE has reviewed and revised statewide procedures for correcting noncompliance for everything below 100% as follows:

CORRECTING EACH INDIVIDUAL CASE OF STUDENT-SPECIFIC NONCOMPLIANCE

To correct noncompliance concerning student-specific requirements, the LEA must submit documentation that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student’s special education file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. If the file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, they must provide evidence that they have informed the receiving LEA that corrections are needed that must be corrected by the receiving LEA. The

LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

CORRECTLY IMPLEMENTING THE SPECIFIC REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

In conjunction with student specific corrections, the LEA will be required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

11 – OSEP Response

None

11 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

12 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

12 – Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

12 – Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

12 – Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 – Indicator Data

12 – Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

12 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	99.62%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.84%	99.62%	94.08%	95.76%	99.16%

12 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

12 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Measurement	Data
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,772
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	521
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,106
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.	107
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	29

Measurement	Data
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	2,106	2,115	99.16%	100%	99.57%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f.

9

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

The remaining 9 delays are outlined below:

- LEA 1: Two IEPs were completed late due to a late transition meeting with Part C. The range of days beyond the third birthday for these two IEPs was 3 to 19 days. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 2: Two IEPs were completed late due to the need for additional testing. The range of days beyond the third birthday for these two IEPs was 12 to 53 days. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 3: One IEP was late due to the need for additional testing. This IEP was completed 27 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 4: One IEP was late due to the need for additional testing. This IEP was completed 55 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 5: One IEP was late due to the need for additional testing. This IEP was completed 114 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.
- LEA 6: One IEP was completed late due to the student having a birthday in the summer when the LEA was not in session. This IEP was completed 58 days beyond the student's third

birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.

- LEA 7: One IEP was late due to the case manager having COVID and out sick. This IEP was completed 29 days beyond the student's third birthday. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with the LEA and provided TA on Part C to Part B transition requirements and timelines.

Attach PDF table (optional)

None

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

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 Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) program has been fully operational since FFY 2009. TEDI accesses the Part C statewide database daily to obtain a list of all students that meet four criteria: 1) student is 27 months old, 2) has not opted out, 3) is actively enrolled, and 4) is considered potentially eligible for Partb. Student data is transferred to TEDI with student demographic information. As the Part C database transfers a student into TEDI, TEDI then accesses the USBE's Statewide Student Identifier Database (SSID) to provide that student with a unique identification number that will continue with that student throughout the student's public education experience in Utah. To ensure confidentiality, individual student-level data are only available to school personnel with the appropriate permissions within TEDI.

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

TEDI provides the USBE and the LEAs with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Partb. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023. In reviewing LEA data on this indicator, the USBE followed guidance provided in the OSEP QA 23-01 document. Noncompliance with timelines for Indicator 12 (34 CFR § 300.124) is identified during an annual review of the TEDI statewide database by the USBE and included with general supervision data.

12 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

12 – FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist completed a fidelity checklist of the Part C to Part B transition process with each LEA that had findings of noncompliance identified to ensure the regulatory requirements were correctly implemented. Additionally, the USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist reviewed additional files, verified that all additional files were compliant, and that all identified LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

In FFY 2021, 17 students were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by the student’s third birthday. The USBE issued the LEAs a written finding of noncompliance. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with each LEA and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure students were evaluated for special education eligibility, and if determined eligible, had an IEP implemented as soon as possible, and, in no case, later than one year. All IEPs were completed prior to the submission date of the FFY 2021 APR.

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

12 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site

monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

12 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist completed a fidelity checklist of the Part C to Part B transition process with each LEA that had findings of noncompliance identified to ensure the regulatory requirements were correctly implemented. Additionally, the USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist reviewed additional files, verified that all additional files were compliant, and that all identified LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

In FFY 2021, 17 students were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by the student’s third birthday. The USBE issued the LEAs a written finding of noncompliance. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist met with each LEA and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure students were evaluated for special education eligibility, and if determined eligible, had an IEP implemented as soon as possible, and, in no case, later than one year. All IEPs were completed prior to the submission date of the FFY 2021 APR.

12 – OSEP Response

None

12 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

13 – Instructions and Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

13 – Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

13 – Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

13 – Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 – Indicator Data

13 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	69.13%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.40%	39.71%	52.10%	69.13%	69.39%

13 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

13 – FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
301	574	69.39%	100%	52.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage

13 – Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The number of files reviewed is dramatically impacted by the size of the LEAs who receive full monitoring. The logistics related to full monitoring (e.g., sample size, USBE random file selection, transfer files) has a drastic impact on our data for this indicator.

Compliant postsecondary services decreased from 87.40% (FFY 2021) to 74.04% (FFY2022). In FFY 2022, when a postsecondary goal for independent living was listed in a file, it was identified as noncompliant if the postsecondary service for independent living was listed as “considered not needed.” The USBE is doing work around independent living and has identified misalignment between the independent living goal and the independent living service. This area demonstrated the highest level of noncompliance for FFY 2022 but may not proportionately reflect compliance for the state as 40% of the noncompliance in this area was from three LEAs who had LEA-wide practices of writing noncompliant services.

Multi-year courses of study decreased from 90.67% (FFY 2021) to 84.32% (FFY 2022). Three LEAs account for 29.8% of the noncompliance in this area. While there is not a clear trend for why this area slipped, IEP teams often list courses of study, but miss the multi-year component.

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

State monitoring

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 for Indicator 13 were collected through full monitoring visits and Indicator 13 monitoring visits focused on reviewing files for compliant postsecondary transition plans. All data were entered in the UPIPS online program. All LEAs will receive a full monitoring visit at least once every six years. LEAs selected for full monitoring visits will be prioritized based on a variety of concerns related to general supervision systems (e.g., concerns with 1% assessment practices, dispute resolution, Indicator 11 and 13 monitoring, Public Education Hotline complaints, fiscal). Full monitoring visits occur onsite at the LEA and include a review of entire student special education files selected by the USBE. The number of files selected for a full monitoring review is based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and may include a small number of postsecondary transition plans. The total number of files reviewed during full monitoring visits varies based on the size of the LEAs reviewed each year. During the visit, the LEA is encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive TA during the review process and all Indicator 13 data that come from a full monitoring visit are included in the SPP/APR. Most of the Indicator 13 data are collected during Indicator 13 monitoring visits. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts for receiving an Indicator 13 file review biennially. The four largest LEAs in the state are included in both cohorts and receive an Indicator 13 file monitoring visit annually. LEAs were stratified by student enrollment, geographical region of the state, race/ethnicity demographics, and socioeconomic level. LEAs across the stratified categories were then randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. The USBE statistician helps compile the cohort list of LEAs to ensure each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs. The rotation for the Indicator 13 review is on an alternating schedule with the Indicator 8 parent survey. In even/odd years, the first cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey, the second cohort

receives an Indicator 13 monitoring visit. In odd/even years, the first cohort receives an Indicator 13 monitoring visit, the second cohort receives the Indicator 8 parent survey. If an LEA is selected for a full monitoring visit the same year its cohort is selected for an Indicator 13 monitoring visit, Indicator 13 will be collected during the full monitoring visit. The LEA will not receive a separate Indicator 13 monitoring visit. During an indicator monitoring review, the USBE reviews up to 10 postsecondary transition plans for all LEAs regardless of the size of the LEA. The LEA selects which files are reviewed by USBE. Indicator file reviews are conducted virtually with the LEA screen sharing while a USBE reviewer collects the data for Indicator 13.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

13 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

13 – FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2021, the USBE determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance when they did not correct the individual noncompliance within the State-established correction window. All individual noncompliance was corrected by showing an additional student file with consent and evaluations to ensure the evaluations were completed within the State-established 45-school day timeline. For LEAs who were issued findings of noncompliance, additional files were also provided by the LEA and verified by the USBE as compliant to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements.

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

The USBE provided TA to LEAs on how to bring each noncompliant postsecondary transition plan into compliance. Upon making corrections, LEAs were required to submit evidence of the now-compliant postsecondary transition plans to the USBE for review. The LEAs submitted the required evidence for all noncompliant plans, the USBE reviewed all the evidence, and verified that all individual cases of noncompliance had been corrected.

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

13 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

13 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Prior to FFY 2022, the USBE determined that LEAs who corrected individual cases of noncompliance within a State-established correction window were also demonstrating the correct implementation of regulatory requirements. LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance when they did not correct the individual noncompliance within the State-established correction window. All individual noncompliance was corrected by showing an additional student file with consent and evaluations to ensure the evaluations were completed within the State-established 45-school day timeline. For LEAs who were issued findings of noncompliance, additional files were also provided by the LEA and verified by the USBE as compliant to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. All noncompliance from FFY 2021 and prior were corrected using this process and were verified within 10 months from the date

noncompliance was identified. The USBE has reviewed and revised statewide procedures for correcting noncompliance for everything below 100% as follows:

CORRECTING EACH INDIVIDUAL CASE OF STUDENT-SPECIFIC NONCOMPLIANCE

To correct noncompliance concerning student-specific requirements, the LEA must submit documentation that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student's special education file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. If the file is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, they must provide evidence that they have informed the receiving LEA that corrections are needed that must be corrected by the receiving LEA. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

CORRECTLY IMPLEMENTING THE SPECIFIC REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

In conjunction with student specific corrections, the LEA will be required to provide additional student special education files for review. The LEA may also be required to show evidence of training, collaboration, and/or other competency-based learning activities. The LEA documents the required evidence by indicating correction and providing it to a UPIPS team member for review in-person, or by uploading the evidence to the UPIPS program.

13 – OSEP Response

None

13 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

14 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

14 – Data Source

State selected data source.

14 – Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

14 – Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population.

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the

current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

14 – I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

14 – II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);

4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

14 – III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school,

describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 – Indicator Data

14 – Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2018	Target >=	28.25%	29.00%	29.75%	17.62%	17.62%
A	19.62%	Data	20.24%	19.62%	19.39%	17.88%	19.70%
B	2018	Target >=	78.67%	81.67%	85.07%	65.50%	65.50%
B	67.60%	Data	68.77%	67.60%	60.56%	65.55%	66.31%
C	2018	Target >=	93.83%	96.83%	99.83%	82.37%	82.37%
C	84.37%	Data	84.32%	84.37%	83.37%	82.82%	82.74%

14 –Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	18.29%	18.97%	20.31%	23.00%
Target B >=	65.81%	66.13%	66.75%	68.00%
Target C >=	82.70%	83.03%	83.69%	85.00%

14 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes

all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

14 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Measurement	Data
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	4,873
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,641
Response Rate	54.20%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	472
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,255
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)	271

Measurement	Data
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).	212

Measure	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	472	2,641	19.70%	18.29%	17.87%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,727	2,641	66.31%	65.81%	65.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
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)	2,210	2,641	82.74%	82.70%	83.68%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Compared with the previous year, we saw a decrease in the graduate count of 64 students, or 1.8%. There was a relatively large increase (109 students, or 54%) in the count of students who ended the year by completing a certificate of completion rather than a regular high school diploma. There was also a relatively large increase in students who exited to enroll in Adult Education (AE) or to pursue a Graduation Educational Development (GED) (67 students, or 73%). There was a significant overall increase in the number of 16- to-18-year-old students going to AW in the last two years. The number of 16-to-18-year-old students who took the GED in Utah increased from

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	1,262 in FFY 2021, to 1,468 in FFY 2022. The number of 16-to-18-year-old students who enrolled in AE increased from 2,112 in FFY 2021, to 2,572 in FFY 2022. The increase in students who received a certificate of completion, transferred to AE, or exited to pursue a GED meant a decrease of 240 students in the “pool” of students working to complete a regular diploma which impacts the number of students with disabilities eligible to attend higher education.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

14 – Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	50.05%	54.20%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric of a +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group was used to determine underrepresentation by the demographics list on the State Demographics Table (https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/EV-lh_id51tFu1DINDICATOR6l_cwe4B6lBSGslXRaYjbOUQLy4GZQ?e=GRG6dA).

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The USBE continues to use data matching with AE to close the gap of responses from students who dropped out which has closed the gap in representative responses over the last several years. The USBE is providing LEAs with strategies for contacting hard to find youth, as well as encouraging and training LEAs to conduct their own surveys rather than using USBE contracted interviewers. There has been an increase in response rates among those LEAs that have conducted their own surveys, especially for underrepresented populations. For this year’s survey (FFY 2022), the USBE continues to match student exit data with AE enrollment data to increase outcome data for those students who had dropped out and have enrolled in adult education for completion of a GED or AE diploma completion. This practice of AE data matching has decreased the gap in the USBE's underrepresentation of survey data for students who dropped out.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

N/A

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Large LEAs are being targeted to improve response rates by encouraging them to conduct their own surveys rather than relying wholly on outside contractors. Recognition for those LEAs with the highest response rates has been implemented annually. AE data match will continue to improve representation of the dropout population.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Nonresponse bias was not identified because there was no demographic group identified as being underrepresented in the responses. The analysis used is included in the demographics table referenced above.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

14 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The demographic categories used to make the determination are outlined in the Utah 2023 Statewide Demographics Report of 2021–2022 Exiters with Disabilities pdf file. A link to this document was included in the section titled “Describe the metric used to determine representativeness.” An additional copy to the link is included here: https://usbe-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/emily_nordfelt_schools_utah_gov/EV-lh_id51tFu1DINDICATOR_6l_cwe4B6IBSGsIXRaYjbOUQLy4GZQ?e=GRG6dA.

14 – Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State

must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

14 – Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The FFY 2022 data for Indicator 14 demonstrated no disproportionality. The implementation of strategies provided by the USBE to LEAs resulted in increases in response rates and decreased gaps in disproportionality. The USBE continues to provide LEAs with strategies for contacting hard to find youth, as well as encouraging and training LEAs to conduct their own surveys rather than using USBE contracted interviewers. There continues to be an increase in response rates among those LEAs that have conducted their own surveys, especially for underrepresented populations. The USBE continues to match student exit data with Adult Education enrollment data to increase outcomes data for those students who had dropped out and enrolled in Adult Education for completion of a GED or Adult Education Diploma. This practice of Adult Education data matching has decreased the gap in the USBE's underrepresentation of survey data for students who dropped out. This year (FFY 2022), the USBE decreased the gap by 3% (1% underrepresentation) of students who dropped out of school. The USBE also increased the overall survey response rate from 50% in FFY 2021 to 55.04% in FFY 2022.

14 – OSEP Response

When reporting the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, the State did not include race/ethnicity and at least one other demographic category in its analysis, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 – Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school by race/ethnicity and at least one other demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process, as required by the Measurement Table.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

15 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

15 – Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

15 – Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

15 – Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 – Indicator Data

15 – Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

15 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	2
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

15 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah's participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still

statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

15 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	44.44%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	N/A	0.00%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data	66.67%	44.44%	80.00%	37.50%	33.33%

15 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

15 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	2	33.33%	N/A	50.00%	N/A	N/A

15 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE held fewer than 10 resolution sessions in FFY 2022. One of the three resolution sessions was successfully resolved through settlement agreements. Due to Utah's consistently low number of resolution sessions, targets are not required.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 – OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

16 – Instructions and Measurement

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))

16 – Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

16 – Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

16 – Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 – Indicator Data

16 – Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

16 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	18
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	5

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

16 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah’s participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

16 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	68.75%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	60.00%	60.25%	60.50%
Data	90.00%	68.75%	62.50%	84.62%	45.45%

16 – Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.75%	61.00%	61.25%	61.50%

16 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5	7	18	45.45%	60.75%	66.67%	Met target	No Slippage

16 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Utah has a very low mediation rate, averaging around 10 mediation sessions per year over the past five years. In 2018, Utah had the second lowest total dispute resolution by State per 10,000 children. The USBE surveyed Indicator 16 targets and data for all 50 states and outlying territories. The USBE reviewed the 10 states with the lowest total dispute resolution by State per 10,000 children. A review of this data in conjunction with the USBE's mediation figures support the baseline data from 2018. Where factors are in the USBE's control (e.g., the retention and

training of skilled, knowledgeable mediators, timely responses to requests for mediation, establishing communication among the parties), the USBE meets the high standards that it sets for itself. However, while the USBE strives to have every mediation result in a mediation agreement, there are many factors in any given mediation session that are outside of the USBE's control.

16 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 – OSEP Response

None

16 – Required Actions

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

17 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

17 – Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

17 – Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

17 – Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

17 – Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

17 – Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the

activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 – Indicator Data

17 – Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Utah will reduce the percentage of students ages 19–22 (super seniors) exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Indicator 14 survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period (from 45.65% in FFY 2020 to 25.65% by FFY 2025).

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset consists of respondents to the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes (PSO) survey who were enrolled as “super seniors” at the time that they exited school. Super seniors are defined as students who did not exit with their four-year graduation cohort (i.e., the students with whom they entered in 9th grade and with whom they were expected to graduate/exit in four years). Instead, they took 1–3 years longer to exit. Generally, these students were between 19 and 22 years of age when they exited school.

The denominator for Indicator 17 includes all super seniors who responded to the PSO survey. The numerator is the count of super seniors who reported being unengaged or under-engaged on the PSO survey.

Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/_specialeducation/_datareporting/_apr-spp-ssip/_ssipevaluationplan/Data2022FebruarySSIPTheoryAction.pdf

17 – Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

17 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	45.65%

17 – Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be less than or equal to the target	43.15%	40.65%	35.65%	25.65%

17 – FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of Indicator 14 Survey Respondents ages 19–22 (super seniors) Reporting as Under-engaged or Disengaged	Total Number of Indicator 14 Survey Respondents ages 19–22 (super seniors)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
147	357	48.73%	43.15%	41.18%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

The data was gathered from the Indicator 14 PSO Survey.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The data is collected for Indicator 14. The data for a subset of students ages 19–22 is pulled out and analyzed for the SiMR.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

17 – Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.

The current evaluation plan is located at <https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/datareporting> under the APR/SPP/SSIP tab in the SSIP Evaluation Plan column.

Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Utah’s SSIP Theory of Action began with the identification of common concerns and vision for improvement among the postsecondary transition stakeholders that make up the Statewide Postsecondary Transition Collaborative (STC) to Improve Post School Outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities. Those concerns were transformed into three broad improvement strategies, including comprehensive supports for youth and families, smooth flow of services, and coordination of services. The Theory of Action then demonstrated how each broad improvement

strategy leveraged the strengths of the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) and its STC partner initiatives and priorities to build statewide capacity for improvement, while at the same time decreasing the impact of infrastructure gaps. All three broad improvement strategies were implemented during the reporting period. To summarize what is required to implement each strategy, common components or considerations of each strategy were turned into improvement activities. These are listed below.

STRATEGY I - COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORTS FOR YOUTH AND FAMILIES (EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SUPPORTS AND RESOURCES FOR TRANSITION-AGE YOUTH AND THEIR FAMILIES - THE "WHO")

a. Professional learning for educators.

- Improve LEA attendance and participation in the Annual Postsecondary Transition Institute for educators. This institute is designed for teams to return year after year to set and complete annual goals to build capacity within their LEA to engage in quality postsecondary transition planning for students with disabilities (SWD) as mandated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

b. Education and opportunities for youth and families (sharing information and improving skills).

- Improve attendance and participation in Transition University for youth with disabilities and their families through the Utah Parent Center.
- Improve enrollment in Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) for SWD through vocational rehabilitation.
- Improve utilization of the Transition Elevated planning app among SWD as they participate in the development of their own Individualized Education Program (IEP) transition plan.

c. Improve access to supports and services for underserved populations

- Improve access to and enrollment in Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathways for SWD.
- Improve LEA knowledge and utilization of the Career Development Credential (CDC) for SWD.

STRATEGY II - SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES FOR TRANSITION-AGE YOUTH (DESCRIBE THE IDEAL SET OF TRANSITION SERVICES AND EXPERIENCES - THE "WHAT")

a. Improve our data match across agencies from 80% to 100%.

- Student-level data sharing agreements in place between USBE, Department of Workforce Services (DWS), and Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).
- Establish a baseline for student-level data match across agencies.

b. Tracking services and engagement over time by student.

- Map services received for a representative sample of 2023 exiters (2024 survey respondents).

c. Create a Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD based on students in our sample who are engaged in the community after school (Indicator 14C).

- Create a flow of services timeline for students, families, and educators.
- Compile student success examples to share with students, families, and educators.

STRATEGY III - COORDINATION OF SERVICES FOR TRANSITION-AGE YOUTH IN UTAH (SYSTEMIC INTENTIONAL COORDINATION, STREAMLINED REFERRAL PROCESSES, ACTIVE COLLABORATION, EDUCATING YOUTH AND FAMILIES — THE 'HOW')

- a. Continue and scale up the work of the STC.
- b. Create a systematic referral process to use for referrals across agencies.
 - Create a standardized referral form with release of information for use between agencies.
 - Create a repository with each agency's information to which postsecondary transition stakeholders can refer students and families.
- c. Improve data sharing system to improve communication and coordination in co-serving youth across agencies.
 - Create an addendum for agency progress reporting forms to track information sharing between agencies.
 - Establish a baseline for the number of LEAs and outside agencies sharing progress data for students being co-served.
- d. Create a common language to communicate with families about postsecondary transition without jargon specific to different agencies.
 - Create a universal document with a common vision of postsecondary transition and a glossary of terms.
 - Build a website to house the vision and resources for postsecondary transition in Utah.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Utah's SSIP describes the state system of postsecondary transition service providers and its efforts to build capacity to assist LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD & evaluate the impact of Utah's improvement efforts. These improvement efforts align with the IDEA & Every Student Succeeds Act. The success of the SSIP requires systematic improvement across the USBE, LEAs, & community partner agencies to leverage existing strengths while simultaneously closing system gaps. These stakeholders need to make the following systems changes to impact the SiMR:

1. Align and leverage current postsecondary transition improvement initiatives across stakeholders.
2. Increase utilization of evidence-based practices (EBPs).
3. Improve infrastructure and coordination for delivering effective PL & TA.
4. Increase meaningful collaboration of state & local stakeholders around SSIP efforts.
5. Increase capacity to effectively utilize national TA resources.
6. Increase capacity at the local level to implement systems that support effective implementation of postsecondary transition planning.

These combined efforts will lead to improved postsecondary transition planning for SWD, which in turn will improve state results in graduation, dropout, & PSO in employment & higher ed. as SWD will have the skills and preparation needed to achieve post school success. To achieve systems change, the USBE implemented the following activities (with their related outputs and/or outcomes) for each improvement strategy. Descriptions of each activity are provided in the summary of EBPs.

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORTS FOR YOUTH & FAMILIES

- (1) The Postsecondary Transition Institute (PTI) hosted 297 total participants, with 265 representing 34 LEA teams, in June 2023. Plans from 27 LEA teams were submitted to the USBE Postsecondary Transition Specialists for review. Team plan themes included increased vocational rehabilitation and Pre-ETS involvement; developing better supports in the areas of self-determination & self-advocacy; increased parent engagement; finding time to meet with the LEA postsecondary planning team; Ind. 13 compliance; PSO survey response increases; school-wide collaboration & work-based learning development. Support is provided to team leaders throughout the year through CoP sessions providing TA & support for postsecondary transition team plan implementation; postsecondary transition-related topics relevant to the team plans; & networking/sharing successes & barriers in postsecondary transition team planning.
- (2) The Supports for Youth and Families Workgroup (SYFW) analyzed previous years' feedback from the PTI for patterns that might inform why teams are not attending & areas for improvement to better meet the needs of those who are. Themes were identified & shared with the PTI planning team for use in planning for 2023.
- (3) The SYFW created a brochure to distribute to educators & families from the STC as a unified collaborative endorsing the three educational opportunities for youth & families above.
- (4) Transition University attendance: 38 youth with disabilities & 279 family members were trained using the Transition University curriculum between 7/1/22 & 6/30/23. This is an increase over the last reporting period.
- (5) Pre-ETS enrollment data: 27,792 transition-age youth were served in special education & 10,500 students had 504 plans in place in the 22–23 school year, making 38,292 students potentially eligible for Pre-ETS services. From 7/1/22–6/30/23, 3,254 students accessed Pre-ETS services. This equates to 8.5% of potentially eligible students accessing Pre-ETS, which is up from under 8% in the last reporting period. (Note: This is only an estimate because the number of potentially eligible students was only the number of students with a current IEP or 504 Plan, whereas, the number of students served in Pre-ETS also includes students with a medical diagnosis but no IEP or 504. Those students who qualify for Pre-ETS w/o an IEP or 504 could not reliably be excluded from the Pre-ETS data due to data collection processes. The percentage of potentially eligible students receiving Pre-ETS services is likely slightly lower, but this is the best comparison available with current data collection practices & remains consistent with the data collected & reported in the baseline year.)
- (6) Transition Elevated App utilization: 1,766 students used the App in the 22–23 school year.
- (7) Using the baseline data from the last reporting period, a focus group study was designed this year to explore the practices of the schools with consistent representation & those with

underrepresentation of SWD in CTE to identify patterns of practices that may inform TA and PL efforts for improvement.

- (8) A survey of educator knowledge on the Career Development Credential (CDC) for SWD showed most educators across disciplines have little to no knowledge of this educational opportunity, contributing to the low number of SWD earning the CDC. We opted to wait on more marketing and outreach since updates are coming to the CDC.

SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES

- (1) The draft outline produced last reporting period was reviewed by all participating agencies. It was determined one broad data sharing agreement would not meet all desired purposes of the committee. Two types of documents were needed: an interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) & specific local data sharing agreements for the purpose of sharing student-level data to enhance coordination while co-serving students. The committee reviewed the MOU used by the State of Maine & has begun drafting a similar MOU for Utah for the Department of Workforce Services, Department of Health and Human Services, & USBE.
- (2) Interviews with Ind. 14 respondents to examine service patterns over time for those who reported being engaged in meaningful post school activities & for those who reported being under-engaged or unengaged were postponed to put into place a more reliable means to contact possible interviewees & improve sample size for this exploration.
- (3) Agencies participating in the STC began identifying the best flow of & timelines for services for their agencies to prepare for the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition.

COORDINATION OF SERVICES

- (1) The Coordination of Services Workgroup (CSW) drafted a universal referral form for all agencies in the STC to use when referring students to services from other providers. The form was reviewed by all agencies to ensure it contained information universally collected by agencies upon referral. A system-wide referral form was created to simplify the process for SWD, their families, & service providers as the first step in coming together as a statewide system of postsecondary transition stakeholders. It is being prepared for a small group of LEAs to pilot.
- (2) A one-stop postsecondary transition website for Utah is almost complete. The structure is done & content is ~90% complete. The CSW acted as the stakeholder group to ensure content represented the statewide system of postsecondary transition rather than one or two individual agencies. As part of this effort, the CSW drafted the vision statement for postsecondary transition for the State of Utah & the purpose statement for the website. They also reviewed & gave feedback on the educators & community partners pages content.

These strategies support systems change as more stakeholders will understand the tenets of postsecondary transition & barriers to services are addressed through deliberate collaboration. These outcomes will lead to SiMR achievement & support efforts to scale-up & create a sustainable long-term improvement effort. Discussions with Utah's stakeholders show the improvement activities currently being implemented are appropriate to impact the SiMR & improve PSO for SWD as educators, students, & families get training & support in postsecondary

transition planning & services & service providers work together to create a unified system of postsecondary transition in Utah.

Did the State implement any *new* (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The STC will continue to work collaboratively to implement the activities as described above. The next steps for each broad improvement strategy are described below.

COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORTS FOR YOUTH AND FAMILIES

- (1) Incorporate the previous PTI feedback analysis into future Institute planning to improve the content to better meet educators' professional learning needs.
- (2) Continue to expand the advertising of the PTI through new STC channels, targeted social media, and target specific LEAs based on results-driven accountability outcomes related to postsecondary transition indicators.
- (3) Add a parent track to the PTI to improve knowledge and understanding of available resources for family members of SWD.
- (4) Create a one-page informational flier and a frequently asked questions document for families about Pre-ETS.
- (5) Host focus groups with educators to identify barriers and solutions to CTE access for SWD.
- (6) Update the CDC in preparation for a new outreach effort.

SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES

- (1) Create a universal addendum to agency reporting for progress data sharing between agencies as they co-serve SWD.
- (2) Analyze Indicator 14 PSO Survey qualitative data for the question, "What positive experiences did you have during high school that helped you achieve your postsecondary goals?" for the last five survey years. Look for themes and patterns to inform the development of the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD.
- (3) Begin drafting the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition.

COORDINATION OF SERVICES

- (1) Implement the universal referral form with participating agencies.
- (2) Complete an MOU between the Department of Workforce Services, Department of Health and Human Services, and USBE.
- (3) Complete Utah's postsecondary transition website development.

The anticipated outcomes in the next reporting period for these strategies are:

- (a) increasing the number of educators and the variety of professionals participating in the PTI in LEA teams;
- (b) increase the number of youth with disabilities and their families participating in Transition University, Pre-ETS, and utilizing the Transition Elevated planning App;

- (c) improve the quality of data sharing agreements between agencies that serve postsecondary transition-age youth; and
- (d) continue to collaboratively (across agencies and organizations) develop defined expectations for postsecondary transition experiences for SWD in Utah.

By achieving these outcomes, Utah will continue to build a statewide system of supports for postsecondary transition and decrease the amount of work being done in silos. This collaborative system will help SWD who remain in special education services after their senior year (ages 19–22) access and utilize services more effectively which will lead to improved levels of engagement after these students exit school.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Utah’s SSIP has selected the following evidence-based practices using the Predictors of Post-school Success research as they relate to our infrastructure improvement strategies:

- Interagency collaboration
- CTE pathway concentration or completion
- Parent training to teach knowledge of transition services
- Self-determination/Self-advocacy
- Student support
- Pre-ETS

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

Interagency collaboration is a clear, purposeful, and carefully designed process in which education professionals establish partnerships with personnel from multiple agencies (e.g., Vocational Rehabilitation, Division of Services for People with Disabilities, Providers, CTE) with the common goal to achieve positive and measurable postsecondary outcomes of SWD.

Interagency collaboration is a means to

- (a) coordinate services and supports at the student level;
- (b) identify and address gaps in services within the local community;
- (c) share and leverage resources to reduce costs; and
- (d) promote efficient service delivery for all SWD.

Interagency teams should lead with the philosophy, disposition, and mindset that all individuals with disabilities can work. (Citation: USBE Interagency Collaboration Tool <https://padlet.com/transitionteams/collaborationteams>)

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

CTE is a sequence of courses that prepares students for a specific job or career at various levels from trade or craft positions to technical, business, or professional careers (Citation: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf) Career Pathways show students a direct connection between doing well in high school and being able to transition smoothly to postsecondary opportunities when they graduate. Students who focus on a Career Pathway acquire the skills necessary for entry into well-paid careers with high potential for rapid financial growth, increased levels of responsibility, and a high degree of personal satisfaction. (Citation: <https://www.schools.utah.gov/cte/about>)

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Parents/families/guardians of youth with disabilities are active and knowledgeable participants in all aspects of postsecondary transition planning (e.g., decision-making, providing support, attending meetings, and advocating for their children) through learning/training opportunities, experiences, and support in postsecondary transition services. To maximize the power of parent involvement in the postsecondary transition process, it is critical for parents to have opportunities to increase their knowledge in this area. Youth with disabilities whose parents expect them to secure employment, attend college, and/or be able to support themselves are more likely to be found employed and accessing further education as young adults. (Citations: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf, http://project10.info/Documents/FINAL_Post_School_Predictor_Product_6.13.19C.pdf, <https://utahparentcenter.org/>)

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy encompasses skills critical to a meaningful adult life. Instruction and experiences in self-determination (the ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, and accept consequences of one's actions) and self-advocacy (the ability to speak up for oneself and communicate what is important) leads to positive PSO for youth with disabilities. (Citation: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf)

STUDENT SUPPORT

Student support is the network of people (e.g., family, friends, educators, and adult service providers) who provide services and resources in multiple settings and environments to prepare students to transition from student life to adult life. This network of people who provide student support should keep in mind the student's postsecondary goals and be aware of the student's strengths, preferences, interests, and needs. The collaboration strengthens the impact of support to the student by broadening the circle of people to include those with firsthand experience in providing adult-based services. Making linkages with the service system that will take over responsibility for ongoing support creates conditions for the youth to move successfully into adult living and working. Student support includes both formal and informal networks. Youth success is enhanced by a network regardless of whether it is formal or informal. These networks promote individualized planning and services to prepare students for adult life. (Citations: https://www.ocali.org/up_doc/Evidence-Based-Predictors-for-Post-school-Success-2018.pdf, http://project10.info/Documents/FINAL_Post_School_Predictor_Product_6.13.19C.pdf)

PRE-ETS

Pre-ETS are offered to any student with a disability, ages 14-22, to aid students in exploring and planning for successful future employment, through targeted training in:

- Career exploration
- Workplace readiness
- Counseling on postsecondary education
- Self-advocacy
- Work-based learning

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities, or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

The development of the STC is a targeted effort to improve interagency collaboration for postsecondary transition in Utah. The activities of the STC (i.e., student level data sharing agreements between agencies, a systematic referral process, development of a common language regarding postsecondary transition, and the creation of the Portrait of Postsecondary Transition for SWD) are designed to bring stakeholders together in a unified system of supports for SWD. This improved collaborative system will support more robust service delivery to SWD as they prepare to transition into young adulthood after exiting the education system. Effective interagency collaboration has been shown to be a positive predictor of postsecondary outcomes in the areas of education and employment (Mazzotti, 2020).

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

Concentration in and completion of CTE pathways have been shown to lead to better postsecondary outcomes for SWD in both education and employment (Lee et. al., 2014; Mazzotti et. al., 2020). By improving access to CTE pathways for our SWD, we are offering opportunities, instruction, and supports that will lead to better engagement in meaningful activity after high school. One avenue in which SWD can benefit from CTE pathway participation is earning the CDC. This is a career-focused work experience that is intended to be earned while a student is working toward a regular high school diploma or the alternate diploma. The purpose of the CDC is to provide internships and/or paid work experiences for SWD aligned with a CTE concentration. Paid work experiences while in high school are another evidence-based predictor of post school success and, as such, support the achievement of the SiMR.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Utah's Parent Training and Information Center, the Utah Parent Center, has developed a parent and youth workshop series called Transition University. Transition University was developed in 2020 in partnership with various postsecondary transition stakeholders in the state. The training is comprised of six topics titled 1) Citizenship & Advocacy; 2) Education, Employment, & Daily Life Skills; 3) Self-Determination & Person-Centered Planning; 4) Safety & Security; 5) Social and Spirituality; and 6) Healthy Living. The training is available throughout the state through live virtual sessions and includes a workbook developed for youth ages 14 and older and a comprehensive transition guidebook for families. This parent-to-parent model of support educates both youth with disabilities and their families in the power of holding high expectations that are realistic and supports effective postsecondary transition planning for SWD. Comprehensive student-driven and family-supported postsecondary transition planning has been shown to improve postsecondary outcomes for SWD. For this reason, the evidence-based practice of parent training to teach knowledge of transition services as embodied in Transition University was chosen as one of Utah's activities to support the achievement of the SiMR.

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

To increase student self-determination, self-advocacy, student-driven IEP planning, and family involvement in postsecondary transition planning, the USBE Special Education Services team developed the Transition Elevated App in 2020 for youth and families to enhance preparation for the postsecondary transition planning IEP process. The App allows students and families to have input in the postsecondary transition IEP process and includes links to outside agencies, tips for a successful postsecondary transition IEP meeting, and considers the student's strengths, preferences, interests, and needs. When the student has completed the questions in the App, a draft postsecondary transition plan is generated for the student and family to share at the postsecondary transition IEP meeting. Increasing the utilization of this App will encourage student self-advocacy in postsecondary transition IEP development. When students are involved in their postsecondary transition planning, they are more motivated to engage in the opportunities, instruction, services, and supports outlined in the postsecondary transition plan which leads to better postsecondary outcomes.

The Utah Parent Center through the Transition University workshops has emphasized student voice and choice through its workbook activities that include instruction and tools for person-centered planning, self-advocacy, disability awareness, soft skills, independent living skills, IEP participation, disability laws, and supported decision making. These workshops improve student knowledge and skills in the postsecondary transition process which, in turn, leads to better postsecondary outcomes.

STUDENT SUPPORT

SWD are supported in developing, refining, and/or working towards achieving their postsecondary goals after high school that are individualized based on their strengths, interests, preferences, and needs. These services are initiated and supported by the adults identified by the IEP team. The services occur through instruction, coaching, and/or providing opportunities for practice and experiences. Examples of targeted support services intended to impact a change or increase in teacher/provider practices that will improve student outcomes include:

- School counselors support SWD for the purpose of planning for the students' futures and ensuring their engagement in school activities which address course planning, graduation, and postsecondary education and employment (i.e., college week, scholarship opportunities, ACT participation, concurrent enrollment, etc.).
- Targeted postsecondary transition services provided in the areas of self-determination/self-advocacy, community-based instruction, work-based learning, the use of assistive technology.

PRE-ETS

LEAs collaborate with Pre-ETS providers to offer SWD the opportunities and experiences to explore and plan for successful future employment through targeted training in job exploration, work-based learning experiences, counseling on postsecondary employment and education, workplace readiness, and instruction in self-advocacy. This training is required to show measurable skill gains for the student in the target area. These measurable skill gains support improved postsecondary outcomes.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

- STC participation data (who is attending, how frequently we meet): Meetings are held monthly. We met four times this year as a full STC and each committee met eight additional times throughout the year. Representatives from 26 organizations and divisions across multiple interagency departments and eight LEAs participated.

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

- SWD participation patterns in CTE pathways annual data and longitudinal data by LEA: An average of 55.03% of students without IEPs concentrated in a CTE pathway over the past five years. An average of 51.78% of students with IEPs concentrated in a CTE pathway over the past five years. An average of 19.03% of students without IEPs completed a CTE pathway over the past five years. An average of 15.93% of students with an IEP completed a CTE pathway over the past five years. Data was also collected by LEA for the same time period.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

- Participation data for Transition University: 38 youth with disabilities and 279 family members were trained using the Transition University curriculum between July 1, 2022, and June 30, 2023.

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

- Data on use of the Transition Elevated App: 1,766 students used the App in the 2022-2023 school year.
- Eight of 27 teams from the PTI chose self-determination or self-advocacy as their goal area on their plan.

STUDENT SUPPORT

- Number of educators participating in PL offered about the postsecondary transition process and transition services: 100 educators completed the postsecondary transition Canvas course, 3 LEAs requested and received specific training on postsecondary transition services, 3 LEAs completed the Transition Coalition Self-Study on the postsecondary transition process with 15 educators participating, 14 educators participated in the Building Meaningful Lives series to learn strategies to support students with complex support needs as they prepare for adult life.
- Seventeen of 27 teams from the PTI chose postsecondary transition services and quality postsecondary transition plans as their goal area on their plan.

PRE-ETS

- From July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, 3,254 students accessed Pre-ETS services. This equates to 8.5% of potentially eligible students accessing Pre-ETS in this reporting period. Vocational Rehabilitation and Utah State University have collaboratively created a tool to capture measurable gains scores for students receiving Pre-ETS. Initial results are positive.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

None

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

Utah will continue to scale up the work of the STC by completing a draft of the MOUs between state agencies that will improve our ability to work together to serve SWD. This process will define what referrals and progress report data sharing will look like among agency partners. Utah will implement the universal referral form created during this reporting period among all stakeholder agencies. Utah will develop a one-stop Postsecondary Transition website for use among all stakeholder groups (i.e., youth, parents, families, educators, and community service providers) that centralizes resource access and establishes a common language for postsecondary transition that all stakeholders can understand.

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

Utah will conduct focus groups with educators in LEAs who have equal or better representation of SWD in CTE pathways and educators in LEAs who have very low representation of SWD in CTE pathways to identify patterns that might lead to improved utilization of this evidence-based practice for SWD in our state. Utah will also explore and implement ways to improve educator knowledge of the CDC for SWD.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Utah will develop and implement new marketing materials for families sponsored by the full group of STC stakeholders. The materials will focus on Pre-ETS services. Information will be disseminated using the STC network to increase the number and diversity of families who have access to these opportunities. Information will also be shared with educators through monthly newsletters so they can share with students and families as appropriate. Additionally, Utah will add a parent track to the annual institute on postsecondary transition.

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

Through the outreach described previously, students, families, and educators will receive information on resources to support SWD in becoming self-advocates. Utah anticipates continued increase in utilization of the Transition Elevated Planning App and Transition University. This will lead to an increase in SWD actively participating in postsecondary transition planning for their own IEPs.

STUDENT SUPPORT

Utah will analyze Indicator 14 survey responses of students who have recently exited from the school system to identify patterns of services that led to those students being meaningfully engaged in education and employment activities after leaving school. Utah will use the results of this analysis to begin development of a Portrait of Postsecondary Transition emphasizing best practices and a timeline of services for successful outcomes in Utah.

PRE-ETS

As stated above, Utah will develop and disseminate additional simplified marketing materials to help families understand and access Pre-ETS. Pre-ETS services will be highlighted at the annual PTI.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Utah reported a decrease of those students reporting as unengaged or under-engaged and met the target for this year. Considering this improvement, the current SSIP implementation plan is still appropriate.

17 – Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

17 – Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. To share data and information and collect feedback on areas such as SPP/APR targets, the USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media with stakeholder groups, including:

- LEA Administrators and Special Education Leadership
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP)
- USBE Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center (UPC)
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs)
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and non-profit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah Educators
- Advocacy groups throughout the State

During FFY 2022, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE SES reviewed the progress of the implementation of the Theory of Action for the SSIP and SPP/APR data with USEAM, USEAP, and the Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD; which includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The APR summit was held virtually on July 30, 2021, with a survey to stakeholders to determine annual targets and end targets for 2025–2026. No changes in targets have been made.

The USBE met and worked with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the least restrictive environment

(LRE). The feedback was used in developing the POMI, Implementation Guide, and the Self Measurement Tool to assist LEAs in providing inclusive opportunities for SWD in the LRE. The USBE collaborated with multiple IHEs to implement USBE TA supporting the LRE.

INDICATOR 3A

- This target is set by OSEP. Stakeholders continually discuss ways to improve Utah's participation.

INDICATORS 3B, C, & D

- Data from FFY 2020 was determined to still be an appropriate baseline. The targets set from the baseline data in FFY 2020 are the average mean from the previous four years of data in conjunction with the linear trend and forecasting. This produced targets that are still statistically relevant and provide a realistic gradual increase across five years. However, for reporting group C (High School), baseline and targets were set based on grade 10 data only and Utah is now submitting grade 9 and grade 10 assessment data. Utah will begin the process for setting a new baseline and targets using grade 9 and grade 10 combined data to be updated during the clarification period.

INDICATOR 8

Questions for the Indicator 8 survey were created in collaboration with the UPC. This collaboration continues as the USBE and UPC continue to use survey data to improve state support and create revisions to survey questions through parent focus groups set to occur in the Spring of 2024.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. As described in the previous submission, the Coordinating Council of People with Disabilities (CCPD) spent more than a year collaboratively determining that improving postsecondary outcomes for youth with disabilities is a vital need in Utah. This led to Utah's change of SiMR focus and creation of the STC to address the CCPD priorities. As a result, an unprecedented number of state agency staff and staff in nonprofit and postsecondary transition-oriented service organizations around the state have collaborated in the work of implementing Utah's Theory of Action and Logic Model through participation in the STC. The collaborating agencies participating in the STC are:

- USBE: Special Education, Adult Education, Youth in Care and Neglected and Delinquent Youth, CTE
- Utah Parent Center
- Utah Statewide Independent Living Council
- Utah Registry of Autism and Developmental Disabilities
- Utah Parent Teacher Association
- Department of Workforce Services: Office of Rehabilitative Services, Career and Education Program (WIOA Youth Program)

- Department of Health and Human Services: High-fidelity Wraparound System of Care, Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice and Youth Services, Stabilization and Mobile Response, Office of Substance Abuse and Mental Health, Division of Services for People with Disabilities, Children with Special Health Care Needs, Division of Family Health, Medicaid
- Intermountain Health Care
- Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind
- Utah System of Higher Education
- Governor’s Committee on Employment for People with Disabilities
- Utah State University Institute for Disability Research, Policy, and Practice

The STC is broken down into three subcommittees – each addressing one of the broad improvement strategies outlined in the Logic Model. These subcommittees have broad representation from the agencies listed above and meet monthly to work through the action plan for each output related to their assigned section. The full STC meets quarterly to review the action plans of the subcommittees and approve proposed actions. Utah's stakeholders were engaged in every stage of the SSIP implementation through participation in the STC.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

The State does not intend to engage in any activities not already described above in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The State does not intend to engage in any activities not already described above in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

The State has not identified any new barriers.

17 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

None

17 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 – OSEP Response

None

17 – Required Actions

None

Certification

Cert – Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Cert – Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Leah Voorhies

Title:

Asst. Supt. of Student Support (State Director of Special Education)

Email:

leah.voorhies@schools.utah.gov

Phone:

8015387898

Submitted on:

04/25/24 6:03:06 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Utah 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
68.89%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	12	60.00%
Compliance	18	14	77.78%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	32%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	34%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	94%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	44%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	94%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	23%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	89%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	22	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	65	0

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34c.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	46.67%	N/A	0
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	YES	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	4.96%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	90.79%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.57%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	52.44%	YES	0
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the [Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table](#).

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Utah

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Measurement	Score
Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Measurement	Score
Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

Table	Total
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) **Valid and Reliable Data** – Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) **Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	<i>EDFacts</i> Files/ <i>EMAPS</i> Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) **Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) **Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Utah

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

Measurement	Total
(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed	23
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	17
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	13
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	16
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	1
(1.2) Complaints pending.	2
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	4

Section B: Mediation Requests

Measurement	Total
(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes	26
(2.1) Mediations held	18
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	8
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	5
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	10
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	7
(2.2) Mediations pending	1
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held	7

Section C: Due Process Complaints

Measurement	Total
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed	10
(3.1) Resolution meetings	2
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings	1
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline	0

Measurement	Total
(3.3) Due process complaints pending	3
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing)	7

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

Measurement	Total
(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed	2
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings	1
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending	2
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Utah

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



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

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Sydnee Dickson
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Utah State Board of Education
250 East 500 South, P.O. Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Dear Superintendent Dickson:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Utah needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Utah's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Utah's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Utah).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024



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

determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)

- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Utah's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Utah-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Utah's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Utah is required to take. The actions that Utah is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Utah's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Utah's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Utah's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Utah's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three



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

IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Utah's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34c.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Utah of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\) | OSEP Ideas That Work](#), [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Utah to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Utah should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Utah to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage Utah to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Utah must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Utah received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Utah took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34c.F.R. §300.606, Utah must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.



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

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under ED Facts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the ED Pass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Utah must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Utah on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Utah's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Utah must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Utah must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:



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

- (1) includes Utah's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Utah's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Utah over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Utah Director of Special Education