

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2024**

Utah



PART B DUE February 2, 2026

**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 Part B. 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 2024, Utah met 19 of 52 targets on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). These included targets related to dropout, proficiency, proficiency gaps between students with disabilities (SWD) and those without, school age environments, preschool environments, preschool outcomes, parent involvement, and timely correction of noncompliance.

All FFY 2024 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 SWD by linking local education agency (LEA) data to improvement efforts.

The USBE updated the annual performance determination (APD) process. Intervention efforts are focused on effective instruction in literacy and math, educational environments, and connections to LEA-wide plans to improve student outcomes. LEAs in "Needs Intervention" and "Needs Substantial Intervention" were required to develop action steps based on placement, proficiency, and growth data as well as existing LEA-wide plans. The USBE has provided targeted support to each LEA and is monitoring the progress related to the action steps.

The USBE is keenly aware of the nationwide and state shortage of special educators. The USBE provides an educator preparation program to prepare individuals to meet requirements for a school-age special education or preschool special education license. To participate, participants must have a bachelor's degree and be employed in an LEA with a provisional Associate Educator License. Candidates/educators can participate in the program even if they are not employed by the LEA as long as the LEA agrees to sponsor them through a statement of assurances. Currently, 561 educators are in the program. As of November 2025, the program has produced 161 licensed special educators.

The USBE continues to increase educational benefit reviews (EBRs) in LEAs. Sessions seek to increase LEA understanding of progress over time and the importance of improving Individualized Education Program (IEP) development and implementation to improve student outcomes.

The USBE continues to target postsecondary transition (PST) through the state systemic improvement plan (SSIP), a [PST website](https://utahtransitionelevated.org/) (<https://utahtransitionelevated.org/>), and a variety of initiatives outlined in the SPP/APR.

The USBE was monitored by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in November of 2024. The USBE values the findings of monitoring and the SPP/APR. The USBE continues to align efforts and budgets to address those areas most impactful to student outcomes.

Intro – Additional information related to data collection and reporting.

In addition to the monitoring processes discussed below, the USBE collects, reviews, and analyzes the following data to improve performance and ensure compliance with the IDEA requirements:

- Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, attendance, student demographics, and student participation in Extended School Year (ESY) services are collected through the Utah eTranscript and Record Exchange (UTREx) clearinghouse and reviewed on Data Gateway.
- Indicator 7 is collected and reviewed in the Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) module of the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) tool.
- Indicator 8 is collected through a survey that is reviewed periodically and when the survey is finalized.
- Indicator 14 is collected through the Utah Post School Outcomes (PSO) Survey that is reviewed periodically and when the survey is finalized.
- Dispute resolution corrective action requirements are tracked on a spreadsheet. Trends are discussed with LEA special education administrators quarterly.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

155

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). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

The USBE systematically monitors and supports compliance by LEAs. This system aligns with the OSEP system to monitor states. General supervision encompasses external monitoring by the USBE and internal monitoring by the LEAs. The purpose 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.

- For program monitoring, the USBE reviews multiple factors including, but not limited to, length of time between visits, individual LEA annual determinations, dispute resolution,

credible allegation investigations, fiscal concern risk, specific populations (e.g., youth in care/custody, English language learners, homeless students), to select at least 26 LEAs to monitor during the year. This ensures all LEAs receive an onsite visit with comprehensive student file reviews, staff interviews, and observations of student instruction at least once during a six-year cycle.

- Fiscal monitoring occurs in conjunction with program monitoring in some of the same LEAs. Virtual meetings are held with the LEA special education director and business administrator for interviews and to review fiscal records.
- For Indicator 4, the USBE uses the discipline data reported by each LEA to calculate LEA rates of suspension/expulsion for SWD overall as well as for SWD by each racial/ethnic group. LEAs with a rate that meets or exceeds 5x the State-level rate for SWD overall and/or for one or more racial/ethnic group(s) are identified as having a significant discrepancy and are required to complete a self-assessment that includes a review of LEA discipline policies and procedures as well as individual student file reviews to review LEA discipline practices. The USBE reviews self-assessments through desk monitoring.
- For Indicators 9 and 10, the USBE uses the child count data reported by each LEA to calculate risk of specific racial/ethnic groups being identified for special education as well as risk of SWD of specific racial/ethnic groups being identified for specific disability categories. LEAs with a risk ratio that meets or exceeds 3.00 are required to complete a self-assessment that includes a review of LEA evaluation and eligibility policies and procedures as well as individual student file reviews to review LEA evaluation and eligibility practices. The USBE reviews self-assessments through desk monitoring.
- Indicator 11 is monitored during program monitoring visits as well as during virtual file reviews focused specifically on initial evaluation timeline compliance (Indicator 11 reviews). In FFY 2024, LEAs were divided into three rotating cohorts as described in Indicator 11 of the SPP/APR. The four largest LEAs receive an Indicator 11 review every other year. When a LEA is chosen for a program monitoring visit the same year the LEA's cohort is scheduled for Indicator 11 reviews, the data for that LEA will be collected during the program monitoring visit, and the LEA will not receive a separate Indicator 11 review.
- For Indicator 12, the USBE uses the early childhood transition data reported by the LEAs to calculate the number of IEPs implemented by eligible students' third birthdays. The LEAs with less than a 100% implementation rate receive an onsite visit from the USBE within six months of identification to ensure the missing IEPs are being implemented and students are receiving a free appropriate public education (FAPE).
- Indicator 13 is monitored during program monitoring visits as well as during virtual file reviews focused specifically on PST plan compliance (Indicator 13 reviews). In FFY 2024, LEAs were split into the same three rotating cohorts as Indicator 11. The four largest LEAs receive an Indicator 13 review every other year. As with Indicator 11, if a LEA is chosen for a program monitoring visit the same year the LEA's cohort is scheduled for an Indicator 13 review, the data will be collected during the program monitoring visit, and the LEA will not receive a separate Indicator 13 review.
- For alternate assessment monitoring (1%), the USBE uses the alternate assessment participation data reported by each LEA to identify LEAs assessing over 1% of their special education population on the alternate assessment. These LEAs are required to submit a

justification letter. The USBE reviews the justification letters and selects a sample of LEAs to conduct desk monitoring of files provided by the LEAs using the UPIPS tool.

- For significant disproportionality monitoring, the USBE uses the child count and discipline data reported by each LEA to calculate rates of identification, placement, and removals. LEAs with a rate that meets or exceeds 7.00 for the first time, or for the second consecutive year without sufficient progress, receive a notification letter from USBE that they are at risk for significant disproportionality. The notification letter recommends conducting a root cause analysis and considering the use of coordinated early intervening services (CEIS). LEAs with a rate that meets or exceeds 7.00 for the third consecutive year without sufficient progress receive a notification letter from the USBE that they have been identified as having significant disproportionality and are required to conduct a root cause analysis and develop a comprehensive coordinated early intervening services (CCEIS) plan based on the outcome of the analysis. CEIS and CCEIS plans are approved by the USBE for fiscal and program requirements. CEIS and CCEIS are monitored as part of program monitoring.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified noncompliance.

The total number of files required for each LEA to provide for a program monitoring visit is determined by a statistical analysis of the size of the SWD population in each of the selected LEAs. Each LEA is required to provide a minimum of 10 files for review. If the LEA does not have 10 files, the USBE will review all the files available. LEAs are required to provide 10 files each for Indicator 11 and Indicator 13 reviews. If the LEA does not have 10 files for one or both indicators, all files available for the indicator(s) will be reviewed.

The USBE selects the files for program monitoring visits. The USBE requires a variety of disability categories, grades, languages, races/ethnicities, genders, and special populations (e.g., youth in care/custody, migrant students, homeless populations) when available. When a LEA has multiple case managers, the USBE requires the LEA to provide one to two files per case manager.

The number of files reviewed related to suspension and expulsion, disproportionate representation, early childhood transition, and the alternate assessment, are chosen based on the data. Most of the time, the number of files available is small, and all files identified through the data are reviewed. When more than 10 students are identified in the data, the USBE will review at least 10 files for compliance. If a pattern of noncompliance is identified during the review, all files will be reviewed.

Each individual case of noncompliance identified will be included in a findings letter and corrected and verified by the USBE within a year. LEAs are also required to show correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. Most often this is shown through new files provided by the LEA from the same case manager. If a LEA does not have new files, the USBE will provide mock students the LEA can use to show their ability to correctly implement regulatory requirements.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

UPIPS TOOL

- UPIPS is the online program used to collect program monitoring, child find, PST, and alternate assessment monitoring data, determine compliance, and verify correction every school year. For the SPP/APR, records are reviewed from the period identified in the corresponding indicator(s).
- UPOD is a module in UPIPS used to collect preschool entry and exit data to determine preschool outcomes every school year. For the SPP/APR, records are reviewed from the period identified in the corresponding indicator(s).

UTREx

- LEAs submit data daily from their student information systems (SISs) to UTREx regarding graduation, dropout, discipline, educational environments, student demographics, special education eligibility, and alternate assessment eligibility. The Data Gateway online tool provides a way for the USBE and LEAs to ensure data were received from SISs correctly. The raw assessment data provided by the assessment vendors every school year is loaded into UTREx to apply the business rules to determine participation, proficiency, and gap rates. For the SPP/APR, records are reviewed from the period identified in the corresponding indicator(s).

QUALTRICS

- Parent involvement data is collected through a survey sent to parents annually. The survey is provided to parents electronically through Qualtrics and on paper through the postal service. For the SPP/APR, records are reviewed from the period identified in the corresponding indicator(s).

TRANSITION FROM EARLY INTERVENTION DATA INPUT (TEDI) SYSTEM

- TEDI is the online program used to collect early childhood transition data every school year. The Baby Watch Early Intervention Program (BWIEP) under the Utah Department of Health and Human Services (UDHHS) manages IDEA Part C. Data from their online program, Baby and Toddler Online Tracking System (BTOTS), is shared with the TEDI system. Districts use the TEDI system to record the results of the transition efforts conducted for these students. For the SPP/APR, records are reviewed from the period identified in the corresponding indicator(s).

UTAH POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES SURVEY WEBSITE

- The PSO Survey is conducted by phone every summer and the data are entered in the Utah PSO website. For the SPP/APR, records are reviewed from the period identified in the corresponding indicator(s).

UTAH GRANTS MANAGEMENT

- UGM is an online program used to collect LEA special education fiscal applications during acceptance periods, fiscal monitoring, and tracking correction of fiscal noncompliance.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

The USBE issues findings of noncompliance to LEAs. The USBE groups related requirements into one finding. For each compliance indicator described in this SPP/APR, the number of findings is the number of LEAs identified with at least one instance of noncompliance.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

The USBE gives each LEA an annual determination consistent with 34 CFR §§ 300.603–300.606 and USBE Special Education Rules (Rules) VIII.G. The USBE follows enforcement consistent with 34 CFR §§ 300.603 and 300.608 and Rules VIII.G.–VIII.H.

The USBE prohibits LEAs from reducing maintenance of effort if the LEA determination is anything other than "Meets Requirements."

LEAs found in "Needs Assistance" for two consecutive years will be provided USBE TA and PL opportunities, targeted support from USBE specialists, support in collaboration with OSEP TA centers and other outside agencies and may have conditions placed on funds.

LEAs found in "Needs Intervention" are provided all the supports provided to LEAs in "Needs Assistance." An LEA in "Needs Intervention" for three or more consecutive years, submits a plan for improvement that is reviewed annually. The USBE supports implementation of the plan. Other interventions that may be considered include corrective action plans, compliance agreements, withholding funds, recovering funds, or referral to appropriate agencies.

LEAs found in "Needs Substantial Intervention" are provided all the supports provided to LEAs in "Needs Assistance." A LEA in "Needs Substantial Intervention" submits a plan for improvement that is reviewed annually. The USBE supports implementation of the plan. USBE also implements fund recovery, withholding of funds, referral to the USBE leadership or another appropriate agency.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

The USBE makes annual performance determinations (APDs) for each LEA. The process consists of an annual data review conducted by the USBE. Consideration for compliance is included through initial evaluation timelines, early childhood transition timelines, suspensions/expulsions of SWD by race/ethnicity, disproportionate representation in special education and by disability category, and postsecondary transition plans. All areas are expected to be 100% compliant.

Valid and reliable data are considered through data submitted for the SPP/APR indicators as well as other required data submissions. Findings are given when data is not timely, valid, and/or reliable.

Correction of identified noncompliance is considered through findings and correction.

Consideration for functional outcomes and performance data in the determination are included through assessment participation, non-participation, proficiency, and growth; event dropout; cohort graduation; PSO response rates, and overall post school outcomes.

Some measurements in the APD are weighted and count for double points including assessment growth, postsecondary transition plans, and overall post school outcomes. Points for some measurements are an average of the points for each sub-component of the measure.

The points for all measurements (weighted and non-weighted) are added together and divided by the maximum points possible for the LEA, then multiplied by 100. The resulting percentage is compared to a rubric of cut scores to decide if the LEA “Meets Requirements,” “Needs Assistance,” “Needs Intervention,” or “Needs Substantial Intervention.”

LEAs are notified by email via the UPIPS tool of the initial APD annually in February. LEAs have 30 days to appeal the determination through the UPIPS tool. All appeals are reviewed and responded to by the USBE. Final determinations are provided to the LEAs via email through the UPIPS tool in March or April.

Determinations are not made public. However, the USBE does post a comparison of each LEA's performance against the state targets on the SPP/APR. This is posted under the FFY LEA Report heading on the APR/SPP/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>).

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

[USBE Special Education Rules:](https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/_specialeducation/_rulesandpolicies/_specialeducationrules/RulesSpecialEducationReport.pdf)

https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/_specialeducation/_rulesandpolicies/_specialeducationrules/RulesSpecialEducationReport.pdf

[UPIPS Manual](https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/compliance_upips/ComplianceUPIPSManual.pdf), located on the UPIPS tab:

https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/programs/compliance_upips/ComplianceUPIPSManual.pdf

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.

The USBE provides TA in a variety of ways to ensure universal participation: meeting, training, and monitoring in virtual and in-person formats; asynchronous and synchronous learning opportunities; a webpage with resources for LEA staff including TA on the IEP Framework and paraeducator standards and manual; interactive modules for TA and evaluation of paraeducators who provide instructional support for SWD; utilization of Padlets to centralize specific information; and utilization of a secure online document transfer platform.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1 & 2

- The USBE developed a TA video module and resource Padlet for Indicators 1 and 2 data including support documents for LEAs to better understand calculations and data reports. LEAs have access to a dropout report and a graduation rate preview report at the beginning

of each school year in Data Gateway. This allows LEAs to update inaccurate high school completion status and exit codes. During August and September each year, TA is provided to LEAs on how to submit updates to ensure valid and reliable data. The USBE has developed TA on policies, procedures, and effective practices to serve SWD who are transferring to adult education.

INDICATORS 3 & 5

- The USBE provides TA to special education directors and special education teachers on federal and state policy for requirements of all students to participate in statewide assessments with detailed information on accessibility and accommodations for all statewide assessments. The training provides guidance on the importance of participation in statewide assessments and how to use data to determine students' strengths and areas of need. The USBE provides implementation support in using data, creating collaborative structures, and engaging in evidence-based instructional practices to increase student achievement through the Assessment to Achievement (A2A) project.
- To address the rising rate of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCD) participating in alternate assessments across the state, the USBE has increased its efforts to support educators in making appropriate assessment decisions for SWSCD.
- The USBE provided APD coaching and support to LEAs in "Needs Intervention" and "Needs Substantial Intervention" as they work on action steps related to improving instructional practices.
- The USBE has continued using and revising its Portrait of Meaningful Inclusion for Students with Disabilities (POMI), Implementation Guide, and Self-Measurement Tool. TA documents continue to be shared at conferences provided across the state. The USBE provided TA to LEAs on special education service time, environment, placement, effective instruction, and inclusive practices to support students with disabilities across the continuum of placements.

INDICATOR 4

- The USBE continues to update and revise the Least Restrictive Behavioral Intervention (LRBI) Technical Assistance Manual to support all students with behavioral needs. The USBE provides training to new special education directors each year regarding Indicator 4 data at the LEA level and provides PL to LEAs identified in need of TA for Indicator 4.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE conducts monthly roundtable meetings for LEA preschool coordinators. TA documents are provided on the state website and system websites such as TEDI and UPOD. TA is also provided during Indicator 12 monitoring visits.

INDICATOR 8

- The USBE provides ongoing technical assistance to LEAs that do not meet their parent involvement score and/or response goal through mentorship, thought partnering, and strategy building. Resources to support family engagement are also developed and shared with LEAs on an ongoing basis.

INDICATORS 9 & 10

- The USBE created and distributed a guidance document to LEAs who were flagged for disproportionate representation. The USBE held one-on-one discussions with LEAs who had

noncompliance upon review of self-assessments to ensure understanding of correction procedures. Additional TA for LEAs with specific questions was provided upon request.

INDICATOR 11

- The USBE provides coaching and TA during monitoring visits with individual teachers during file reviews.

INDICATORS 13 & 14

- TA documents include Tips for Writing Compliant Transition Plans, PST Services Examples, IEP Reflective Framework: Preschool to PST, and PSO TA for LEAs.
- The USBE provides Indicator 13 Roundtables and a Canvas course for targeted LEAs.
- Padlets for PST cover topics such as PST assessments, the PST process, virtual resources, and post school outcomes. The Padlets offer educators a central location to access links to needed resources and support to maximize their PL opportunities.
- The PST website (www.utahtransitionelevated.org) is a comprehensive resource for all stakeholders and provides educators with resources in all areas of PST.
- Virtual communities of practice (VCOPs) take place throughout the year to support LEAs with preparations for the PSO survey and with analyzing their data to strengthen practices that will improve PSO survey response and student outcomes.
- Padlets for PSO provide recordings, TA documents, and other resources to help LEAs navigate through the process of the PSO survey. The Padlets offer educators a central location to access links to needed resources and support to maximize their PL opportunities.

INDICATORS 15 & 16

- The USBE provides ongoing information regarding current trends in dispute resolution data as well as TA to address recurring issues at quarterly meetings with special education directors.
- The USBE developed TA for LEAs to better understand early dispute resolution options that relate to Indicator 16 and early dispute resolution options.

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 professional learning (PL) in a variety of ways including in-person, virtual, asynchronous, and synchronous opportunities. The USBE protects student instruction time by limiting PL experiences during school hours.

In July 2024, the USBE hosted its annual Institute on Special Education Law. Virtual and in-person options were provided. Current information on IDEA requirements was provided to 1,291 attendees including educators, lawyers, and school administrators. Session topics were on recent court decisions and trends, behavior, assistive technology, independent education evaluations, parent participation, least restrictive environment, manifestation determination, student data privacy, specially designed instruction, child find, fiscal, preschool, graduation, and program monitoring.

The USBE hosted four APD data and action planning sessions in the summer of 2025. The sessions reviewed student data related to growth, proficiency, and educational environments with 200 participants from 49 LEAs. Each LEA developed action steps related to reviewed data and school wide plans for improvement. The USBE continues to follow up with participants on progress.

The USBE provides an educator preparation program to prepare individuals to meet requirements for a school-age special education or preschool special education license. To participate, participants must have a bachelor's degree and be employed in an LEA with a provisional Associate Educator License. Currently, 561 educators are in the program. As of November 2025, the program has produced 161 licensed special educators.

The USBE hosted seven New Leaders' Summit (NLS) sessions in school year (SY) 24–25. Session participants are new special education leaders within their first three years of the position. Topics included fiscal, SPP/APR indicators, the APD process, parent engagement, PST, data submission, graduation, dropout, paraeducators, evaluations, IEPs, ESY, accommodations, assessment, adapted P.E., discipline, SWSCD, inclusion of SWD, assistive technology, educational benefit, instructional strategies, and PSO. Participants were assigned a mentor to follow up on topics and needs. In SY 24–25, 59 LEAs were assigned mentors, 519 participants enrolled, and 350 completed all sessions.

The USBE hosted Running Start for new educators within their first three years of the position. Ninety educators registered from 11 LEAs. Topics included behavior, IEPs, specially designed instruction (SDI), literacy instruction, and math instruction.

The USBE Training Request Portal (TRP) allows LEAs to request PL and TA for all areas of student support at the USBE. The USBE meets weekly to review requests and assign staff to follow up on the requests. Requests lead to PL opportunities, TA, and targeted support. In SY 24–25, 46 LEAs made 238 requests. Eight of the 46 LEAs made multiple requests.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE is hosting an ongoing community of practice (COP) for LEAs to improve collaboration between special education, school counselors, and adult education staff to decrease the number of students exiting the K–12 system to attend adult education, and to ensure SWD are provided options before leaving the K–12 system to enter adult education.
- The USBE has developed a team of specialists to address statewide chronic absenteeism and dropout prevention. The team has created an Absenteeism Toolkit, provides monthly absenteeism webinars, and early warning systems training.
- The USBE Institute on PST is held with one day of learning opportunities focused on various areas of PST targeted to all stakeholders, including youth and families, with a second day for LEA-based interagency teams to work on annual goals and activities to be implemented.
- The USBE provides an Indicator 13 self-assessment tool for LEA teams to use in facilitating a data dive and root cause analysis for five of the most challenging compliance requirements for writing PST plans, in addition to utilizing the results to improve the programming and/or services provided for SWD. Monthly PST Talks for educators to receive TA on various PST areas are also provided.

- The USBE Canvas course on PST is available to take asynchronously. The course is also sometimes made as a requirement for practitioners because of data collected as part of monitoring. Some LEAs participating in monitoring are required to attend PST roundtables.
- The USBE recorded a PSO Survey training conducted in May 2025. One hundred forty-six individuals accessed the recording. A live Q&A session was held for all LEAs who viewed the recording. For the 2025 survey, 49 LEAs conducted their own surveys, and 21 followed up after the USBE's contractor attempted the surveys.

INDICATORS 3 & 5

- The USBE provides annual alternate assessment administration and compliance training across the state for teachers and test coordinators. The training focuses on identifying SWSCD, how to administer Utah's alternate assessment as well as implementing instructional practices and supports for SWSCD.
- The USBE provides alternate achievement standards instruction including a curriculum mapping workshop, assessment, accommodations and assessment administration, inclusive practices, placement, and least restrictive environment (LRE).
- The USBE partners with a company named MGT for the Assessment to Achievement (A2A) project supporting the use of data, creating collaborative structures, and engaging in evidence-based instructional practices to increase student achievement.
- The USBE continues to help LEAs improve student academic outcomes in early literacy through a Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) training for elementary teachers, coaches, and administrators based on the Science of Reading (SOR). The LETRS training is reinforced with follow-up coaching support and strategic quarterly literacy walks involving USBE and LEA coaches doing classroom observations, debriefings, and discussion groups.
- A two-year co-teaching coaching model continues to be implemented in LEAs involving cohorts of secondary academic coaches, teachers, and administrators to increase academic outcomes for SWDs in the general education classrooms.
- An elementary math roundtable has been implemented statewide for elementary special educators. The roundtable focuses on teaching special educators the content of the Utah Core Standards for mathematics. This is a year-long PL for elementary special educators to help build their content knowledge.
- EBR is a learning experience for educators and instructional leaders to become aware of the review process used to increase the substantive standard of compliance for students to receive a FAPE to further outcomes through access to grade level learning standards.
- Additional targeted training includes universal design for learning (UDL), SDI, accommodations and accessibility in instruction and assessment, co-teaching, paraeducators, and inclusion of SWD in core subjects.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE provides monthly roundtable meetings for all LEA preschool coordinators. The USBE offers documents, videos, PL opportunities, and resources shared through a monthly newsletter to all LEAs. The Annual Utah Preschool Conference is available to all LEAs and early childhood educators.

INDICATORS 15 & 16

- The USBE provides PL to LEAs as the result of a state complaint decision or Due Process hearing decision.

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 for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATORS 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

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

YES

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.

Parents attended the APR Summit in July 2021 and provided input on APR targets. 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 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 USEAP and UPC staff ways to reach out to and connect with parents who are traditionally underrepresented in the stakeholder feedback collection process. The 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.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE absenteeism and dropout prevention workgroup provides LEAs with strategies and training to engage parents, students, educators, and the community in supporting student attendance and preventing dropout.
- The USBE's annual institute on PST included parent and youth education tracks to engage parents and youth in the PST process. The new PST website is a comprehensive resource for all stakeholders that provides resources for educators and parents in all areas of PST.

INDICATORS 3 & 5

- The USBE conducted four regional workshops designed for teams to participate in curriculum mapping aligned with alternate achievement standards for SWSCD. LEAs collaboratively determined when and how instruction using these alternate achievement standards would be delivered, ensuring support for students' learning and access to their grade-level standards and curriculum.
- The USBE continues to provide new special education directors and teachers with available policies and expectations for student learning and participation in statewide assessments. The USBE staff provide PL on how to provide high quality instruction for SWD and the importance of providing access to grade level standards. The USBE monitors student performance and collaborates with LEAs on student data results to analyze performance and discuss areas of concerns including ways to improve student achievement.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE engages in the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations, including the large parent engagement component. Preschool transition conferences are held with IDEA Part C, Part B, and parents.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- The USBE engages with community partners related to parent and family engagement. Feedback is collected on an ongoing basis as the USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related to family engagement.
- The USBE may provide PL to an LEA because of dispute resolution. Common areas include child find, evaluation, eligibility, IEP, and placement. In 2024, the USBE was accepted by the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution (CADRE) Collaborative Workgroup as a partner with the UPC to work on building capacity for local early dispute resolution options.

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 “Stakeholder Engagement” 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.

The USBE annually reviews the SPP/APR with stakeholders listed in the “Stakeholder Engagement” section and makes adjustments based on input.

The USBE continuously seeks public input regarding special education rules, guidance, monitoring processes, PL, and TA. The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input. Stakeholders consistently provide input through collaborative meetings, public comment, written communication, survey data, data analysis, and informal conversations. The USBE employs meetings, newsletters, emails, surveys, and social media.

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, relevant Utah PTA leadership, as well as the relevant staff at all State of Utah Agencies and identified 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 changes proposed to the FFY 2024 SPP/APR.

Intro – Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2023 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 2023 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 2023 APR in 2025, is available.

Within 120 days of the State's submission of its FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the USBE prepared and published a report on the FFY 2023 performance of each LEA in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR. The report is posted under the FFY LEA Report heading on the APR/SPP/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 2023 SPP/APR is posted on the APR/SPP/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 USBE 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 2024 APR will be reported to the USBE in the March 2026 Board meeting.

Intro – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2024 and 2025 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2025 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 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2026, 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 2023 SPP/APR

Utah's Part B IDEA determination in 2024 and 2025 was Needs Assistance, and the USBE has participated in national TA to improve outcomes and taken action as a result of the TA received.

The USBE participates in virtual calls, conferences, symposiums, and one-on-one support with multiple national TA centers. Additionally, TA documents provided by the centers are used by the USBE regularly to support LEAs. Centers used include

- American Institute for Research Center on Multi-Tiered System of Supports (AIR)
- CADRE
- Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)
- Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID)
- Collaboration for Effective Educator Development Accountability and Reform Center (CEEDAR)
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

- Data Center Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD)
- Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)
- IDEA Data Center (IDC)
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
- National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI)
- National Center for State Systemic Improvement (NCSI)
- National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)
 - 1% Cap Community of Practice
- The National Technical Assistance on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C)
- OSEP
- Parent Training and Information Centers (PTI)
- Promoting Rigorous Outcomes and Growth by Redesigning Educational Services for Students with Disabilities Center (PROGRESS Center)
- State Education Agency Leaders (SEAL)
- Technical Assistance Center for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE)
- Westat
- WestEd

Actions taken because of technical assistance include:

- ECTA child outcome documents are regularly reviewed and shared with LEAs and used to help the USBE develop state-specific guidance.
- Private school proportionate share, fiscal compliance and accountability policies, CCEIS allocation questions, and combined program and fiscal monitoring TA from CIFR impacted the USBE policies and guidance.
- Preschool participation in NASDSE COP focused on data and inclusion of SWD. Provided effective processes for LEAs on data collection, analysis, inclusive practices, and meeting federal requirements.
- Metrics in significant disproportionality were adjusted, and reports were run, related to identification, placement, and discipline based on work with DCASD. TA was also provided to LEAs related to CCEIS.
- In connection with TA from IDC, the USBE evaluated its general supervision system. Adjustments were made to the Indicators 9 and 10 self-assessment and verification of LEA evidence. The IDC interactive institute provided potential ideas related to APD and clarified requirements related to findings of noncompliance. The USBE continually uses several resources provided through the IDC website.
- Changes to monitoring, dispute resolution, maintenance of effort, and CCEIS reporting occurred related to TA from OSEP.
- Intensive PST TA planning, PST institute, and PST COP work have been done in collaboration with NTACT:C.
- CADRE resources have been used to train the USBE staff, USBE dispute resolution contractors, the UPC, and LEAs.
- NCSI general supervision calls have been attended by fiscal and program specialists and have increased collaboration in monitoring efforts.
- Teacher retention efforts have been promoted through TA from CEEDAR.
- PTI efforts have built collaboration with the UPC including partnering on a grant application.

- The USBE participated in WestEd fiscal training leading to an increase in accuracy in responding to LEAs and process practices. WestEd provided TA on monitoring IDEA grants, addressing CCEIS, allowable use of funds, and monitoring that have impacted policy and practice.
- SEAL meetings provided opportunities for state directors of special education to share solutions to barriers and stretch thinking about strategic initiatives. SEAL provided opportunities for mentoring new state directors.
- General supervision with a specific focus on monitoring and findings has been adjusted based on NCSI general supervision meetings.
- EDFACTS IDEA files submission has improved with help from CIID. The USBE was successfully able to submit 18 files through Generate. Data submissions are cleaner and more consistent.
- NCEO provided TA regarding the alternate assessment disproportionality methodology.

Intro – OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2024 and 2025 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2025 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 2, 2026, 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 2025 and 2026 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2026 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 2025 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2027, 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 EDFacts 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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	75.86%	67.90%	67.90%	68.66%	69.43%
Data	72.36%	56.34%	66.92%	65.64%	65.85%

1 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	70.95%	74.00%

1 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.

- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

1 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,731
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	283
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	375

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	147
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	993

1 – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
3,731	5,529	65.85%	70.95%	67.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 the 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 Administrative 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 USBE.

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)

None

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 EDFacts 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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	30.86%	25.81%	25.81%	24.58%	23.35%
Data	23.56%	17.27%	25.07%	22.34%	21.44%

2 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	20.90%	16.00%

2 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.

- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

2 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,731
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	283
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	375

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	147
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	993

2 – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
993	5,529	21.44%	20.90%	17.96%	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).

To meet the USBE's October 1 data submission deadline, students have until September 30 to complete graduation requirements for the prior school year, and LEAs have until September 30 to update exiter status. In September, the USBE notifies each LEA flagged with a high dropout rate for the previous school year and provides a preliminary dropout report to review before the October 1 deadline. LEAs receive guidance on correcting coding errors and dropout recovery practices through the USBE-provided PL sessions, TA documents, and individualized support as needed.

2 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 – OSEP Response

None

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 C.F.R. §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%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	81.14%

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
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	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%

3A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

3A – FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

3A – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts (ED*Facts* file spec FS188; Data Group: 882, 883)

3A – Reading Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,687	6,183	11,258
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	7,533	4,743	4,856
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	136	108	3,336
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	459	465	952

3A – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 880, 881)

3A – Math Assessment Date

01/07/2026

3A – Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	8,687	6,193	11,230
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	7,453	4,633	4,755
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	198	135	3,312
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	459	464	952

(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 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,128	8,687	93.24%	95.00%	93.57%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,316	6,183	86.20%	95.00%	85.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,144	11,258	76.80%	95.00%	81.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

3A – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8,110	8,687	93.12%	95.00%	93.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5,232	6,193	85.23%	95.00%	84.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,019	11,230	78.57%	95.00%	80.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 3–8 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](https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/) 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 [USB E Data and Statistics Reports](https://www.schools.utah.gov/datastatistics/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 data will be linked to an Excel spreadsheet.

- The "Participation by Assessment Type" tab 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 outlines the USB E'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)

None

3A – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A – OSEP Response

None

3A – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against 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 EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

3B – Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment})]$. 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	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	15.48%	16.45%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	8.74%	10.17%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	8.83%	9.51%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	20.43%	21.12%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.54%	7.05%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	4.60%	5.38%

3B – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

3B – FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

3B – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

3B – Reading Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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	7,669	4,851	8,192
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,412	433	537
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	9	300

3B – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

3B – Math Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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	7,651	4,768	8,067
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,732	360	263
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	15	4	113

(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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,416	7,669	17.80%	15.48%	18.46%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	442	4,851	7.88%	8.74%	9.11%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	837	8,192	7.04%	8.83%	10.22%	Met target	No Slippage

3B – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,747	7,651	22.83%	20.43%	22.83%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	364	4,768	7.40%	6.54%	7.63%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	376	8,067	3.78%	4.60%	4.66%	Met target	No Slippage

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 3–8 and the UA+ assessment for grades 9 and 10. Utah's school report card shows proficiency of all students and SWDs. 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 (Kindergarten – 8 or High School) can be selected at the top. Additional details for achievement can be viewed by clicking the "View Details" button on the "Achievement" tile, then again for each individual subject.

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

None

3B – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B – OSEP Response

None

3B – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against 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 EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

3C – Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment})]$. 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	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	15.49%	15.92%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	24.43%	25.12%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	28.14%	28.88%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	31.93%	32.43%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.81%	7.38%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	14.61%	15.20%

3C – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

3C – FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

3C – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

3C – Reading Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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	459	465	952
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	53	133	265

3C – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

3C – Math Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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	464	952
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	132	32	132

3C – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	53	459	11.13%	15.49%	11.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	133	465	26.32%	24.43%	28.60%	Met target	No Slippage

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	265	952	28.75%	28.14%	27.84%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

3C – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	132	459	26.55%	31.93%	28.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	32	464	8.10%	6.81%	6.90%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	132	952	13.21%	14.61%	13.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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, 9, and 10 are reported on the [USB E Data and Statistics Reports](https://www.schools.utah.gov/datastatistics/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 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 the USB E'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)

None

3C – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C – OSEP Response

None

3C – Required Actions

None

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates For Children with IEPs and All Students Against 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 EDFacts 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 2024-2025 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 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 2024-2025 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 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	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	22.84	22.36
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.15	34.67
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	35.55	34.59
Math	A <=	Grade 4	24.74	24.25
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.19	29.86
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.92	25.52

3D – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all

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

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

3D – FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

3D – Reading Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

3D – Reading Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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	47,761	46,205	89,393
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,669	4,851	8,192
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	21,325	19,586	40,293
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	14	9	969
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,412	433	537
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	9	300

3D – Math Assessment Data Source

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

3D – Math Assessment Date

01/07/2026

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	47,649	45,788	86,943
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	7,651	4,768	8,067
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	23,315	18,311	28,358
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	58	16	518

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,732	360	263
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	15	4	113

(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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.46%	44.68%	26.13	22.84	26.21	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.11%	42.41%	34.52	35.15	33.30	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10.22%	46.16%	35.14	35.55	35.94	Did not meet target	No Slippage

3D – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	22.83%	49.05%	27.05	24.74	26.22	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.63%	40.03%	32.19	30.19	32.39	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.66%	33.21%	27.69	25.92	28.55	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

None

3D – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D – OSEP Response

None

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

4A – Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: 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.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

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 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024

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 2024 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 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 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 Memorandum 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A – Indicator Data

4A – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	18.18%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Data	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	31.25%	38.89%

4A – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

4A – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards

family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.

- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

4A – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

For Indicator 4A, to meet the minimum n- and cell-sizes for the school year, there had to be at least 10 students with disabilities (SWD) enrolled in the LEA (n-size), and there had to be at least two students with disabilities who received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions (OOS removals) of greater than 10 days in the LEA (cell size).

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the

definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to update, improve, and develop protocols for the Indicator 4 process . The USBE explored three new calculations for setting the state bar with three options for minimum n- and cell sizes, for a total of nine new methodology combinations. The three n and cell size options the USBE explored included: 1) n size >= 30 and no minimum cell size (the status quo minimums); 2) n size >= 30 and cell size > 1; and 3) n size >= 10 and cell size > 1. With the help of stakeholder feedback, the USBE’s preferred combination of state bar calculation and minimum n- and cell-sizes was chosen based on finding a balance of minimizing the number of LEAs excluded due to not meeting minimum n- and cell sizes, reducing “false positives” due to the composition of many small and unique charter schools in Utah, and not over-burdening the USBE or LEA staff with unmanageable numbers of, and excessively repetitive, reviews.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

No change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

The minimum n- and cell sizes were not changed.

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n/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.

136

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
8	19	38.89%	0.00%	42.11%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Among the 19 LEAs that met the minimum n- and cell sizes in FFY 2024, seven were LEAs that did not meet the minimums in FFY 2023. Among the eight LEAs that were identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2024, four were LEAs that were not identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2023. One of these four LEAs was identified due to a data error.

With the LEAs being reviewed in FFY 2024 being different than the LEAs being reviewed in FFY 2023, it is not surprising that the result of the reviews (i.e., the count of LEAs identified with a significant discrepancy) was different. We do acknowledge that some of the identified LEAs have been identified multiple years in a row. The slippage in the USBE’s rate of LEAs with significant

discrepancy is a mix of a reflection of changes in data that allowed new groups to be reviewed as well as some continued or worsening identification among previously identified groups and LEAs.

Among the LEAs identified with significant discrepancy multiple years in a row, we believe that part of the reason the significant discrepancy has continued to persist has been the result of the Indicator 4 data being lag data, such that LEAs have not been reviewing data at a time when they can make actionable changes to their policies, practices and procedures (PPP) to prevent the significant discrepancy from persisting into future years. As such, the USBE has been working on our process and correction of noncompliance requirements to put more focus on proactive steps LEAs can take to improve outcomes for current students.

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE sets a "state bar" at a rate of five times the State's rate of OOS removals of greater than 10 days for SWD. A significant discrepancy occurs when an LEA's rate exceeds the state bar and the LEA meets the minimum n- and cell sizes. For FFY 2024, the State rate was 0.10% and the state bar was 0.51%.

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

None

4A – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023–2024 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 of the eight LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2024 were required to conduct a self-assessment review of their discipline policies and procedures including 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 IDEA Procedural Safeguards. The self-assessments were submitted to the USBE for review and determination of compliance, the need for correction, and verification of implementation of regulatory requirements.

The eighth LEA was the one identified due to a data error. This LEA was required to participate in training on how to review its data in the state data warehouse, conduct a review of its current data, and provide to the USBE a sign-in sheet from the training and documentation of verification of the review.

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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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.

In FFY 2024, five LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance. Prior to the submission of this SPP/APR, the USBE reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices for four of the five LEAs. The USBE determined policies were compliant, but procedures and practices required revision. All four LEAs completed required training; conducted root cause analyses of the reasons for high rates of OOS removals including removals of current students, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and whether they are addressing behavior in the IEP; updated PPPs; and provided evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements. The USBE reviewed the updated data and determined that the four LEAs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements.

The fifth LEA self-assessment and student review was completed in November 2025 and reviewed by the USBE. The LEA did not complete the self-assessment and student specific file reviews by the given deadline due to a change in leadership in the LEA. Findings were issued to the fifth LEA on December 9, 2025. The fifth LEA has until May 25, 2026, to engage in a structured root cause analysis, develop discipline goals aimed at reducing suspension rates for identified student groups, update policies and procedures, and provide evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements. This will be completed and reported in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR.

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

4A – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEA 1: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination and FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: The USBE conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training participation, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEA 1: 4 cases: The LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. All four students had transferred out of the LEA. The receiving LEAs were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 16 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. One student had graduated, 12 students had transferred out of the LEA, and three students were still enrolled. The receiving LEAs for the 12 transfer students were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The three students who maintained enrollment in the LEA all had current IEPs and were receiving services. Each student was suspended during the school year, but none for more than five school days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 7cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. Four students had transferred out of the LEA and three students were still enrolled. The receiving LEA s for the four transfer students were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The three students who maintained enrollment in the LEA all had current IEPs and were receiving services. Each student was suspended during the school year. One student was suspended for more than ten days, procedural safeguards were provided, and a manifestation determination review was conducted. Services were provided during the suspension. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 3 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. Two students had transferred out of the LEA and one student was still enrolled. The receiving LEAs for the two transfer students were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The one student who maintained enrollment in the LEA was exited from special education and was no longer receiving services. The student was suspended during the school year, but only for seven days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: 1 case; the LEA reviewed the status of the student to ensure the student was receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. The student had transferred out of the LEA. The receiving LEA was provided with the student file and information for successful transfer. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

4A – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4A – Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2023 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

4A – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

4A – OSEP Response

None

4A – Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2024 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards)}}{\text{(\# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

4B – Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), 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

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: 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.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term

suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

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 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 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 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 Memorandum 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing

a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	46.67%	37.50%

4B – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

4B – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

For Indicator 4B, to meet the minimum n- and cell-sizes in a racial/ethnic group for the school year, there had to be at least 10 students with disabilities (SWD) in that racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA (n-size), and there had to be at least two students with disabilities in that racial/ethnic group who received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions (OOS removals) of greater than 10 days in the LEA (cell size).

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The USBE worked directly with the IDC in FFY 2021 to update, improve, and develop protocols for the Indicator 4 process . The USBE explored three new calculations for setting the state bar with three options for minimum n- and cell sizes, for a total of nine new methodology

combinations. The three n and cell size options the USBE explored included: 1) n size ≥ 30 and no minimum cell size (the status quo minimums); 2) n size ≥ 30 and cell size > 1 ; and 3) n size ≥ 10 and cell size > 1 . With the help of stakeholder feedback, the USBE’s preferred combination of state bar calculation and minimum n- and cell-sizes was chosen based on finding a balance of minimizing the number of LEAs excluded due to not meeting minimum n- and cell sizes, reducing “false positives” due to the composition of many small and unique charter schools in Utah, and not over-burdening the USBE or LEA staff with unmanageable numbers of, and excessively repetitive, reviews.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

There is no change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

There is no change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/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.

142

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
8	5	13	37.50%	0%	38.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 sets a “state bar” at a rate of five times the State’s rate of OOS removals of greater than 10 days for SWD. A significant discrepancy occurs when an LEA’s rate for a racial/ethnic

group exceeds the state bar and the LEA meets the minimum n- and cell sizes. For FFY 2024, the State rate was 0.10% and the state bar was 0.51%.

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

None

4B – Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 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 of the eight LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in FFY 2024 were required to conduct a self-assessment review of their 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 IDEA Procedural Safeguards. The self-assessments were submitted to the USBE for review, along with the student files used for the self-assessment and USBE determined compliance, the need for correction, and verification of implementation of regulatory requirements.

The eighth LEA was identified due to a data error. This LEA was required to participate in training on how to review its data in the state data warehouse, conduct a review of its current data, and provide to the USBE a sign-in sheet from the training and documentation of verification of the review.

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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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.

In FFY 2024, five LEAs were issued findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices for the four LEAs identified for significant discrepancy. The USBE determined policies were compliant, but procedures and practices required revision. Four LEAs completed required training; conducted root cause analyses of the reasons for high rates of OOS removals including removals of current students, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and whether they are addressing behavior in the IEP; updated PPPs; and provided evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements.

The fifth LEA self-assessment and student review was completed in November 2025 and reviewed by the USBE. The LEA did not complete the self-assessment and student specific file reviews by the given deadline due to a change in leadership in the LEA. Findings were issued to the fifth LEA on December 9, 2025. The fifth LEA has until May 25, 2026, to engage in a structured root cause analysis, develop discipline goals aimed at reducing suspension rates for identified student groups, update policies and procedures, and provide evidence of correct implementation of regulatory requirements. This will be completed and reported in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR.

4B – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

4B – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEA 1: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination and FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: The USBE conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training participation, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 6: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEA 1: 4 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. All four students had transferred out of the LEA. The receiving LEAs were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 16 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. One student had graduated, 12 students had transferred out of the LEA, and three students were still enrolled. The receiving LEAs for the 12 transfer students were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The three students who maintained enrollment in the LEA all had current IEPs and were receiving services. Each student was suspended during the school year, but none for more than five school days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 7 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. Four students had transferred out of the LEA and three students were still enrolled. The receiving LEAs for the four transfer students were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The three students who maintained enrollment in the LEA all had current IEPs and were receiving services. Each student was suspended during the school year. One student was suspended for more than ten days, procedural safeguards were provided, and a manifestation determination review was conducted. Services were provided during the suspension. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 3 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. Two students had transferred out of the LEA, and one student was still enrolled. The receiving LEAs for the two transfer students were provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The one student who maintained enrollment in the LEA was exited from special education and was no longer receiving services. The student was suspended during the school year, but only for seven days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: 3 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. All three students were still enrolled in the LEA. All three students continue to receive special education services and have been suspended during the school year. None of the suspensions exceeded ten days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 6: 2 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. One student had graduated and one was still enrolled. The student who maintained enrollment in the LEA had a current IEP and continued to receive services. The student had

suspensions during the school year but did not exceed four school days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

4B – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4B – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2023 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 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 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 2023. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case or child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4B – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

4B – OSEP Response

None

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2024 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 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 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 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case or child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2018	Target >=	59.41%	65.12%	65.12%	65.79%	66.47%
A	65.12%	Data	67.84%	70.54%	72.13%	73.60%	74.12%
B	2018	Target <=	13.15%	9.71%	9.71%	9.43%	9.16%
B	9.71%	Data	9.13%	8.43%	8.44%	8.53%	8.37%
C	2018	Target <=	3.00%	2.78%	2.78%	2.77%	2.75%
C	2.67%	Data	2.58%	2.68%	2.54%	2.35%	2.31%

5 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	67.81%	70.50%
Target B <=	8.61%	7.50%
Target C <=	2.68%	2.65%

5 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

5 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	88,684
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	66,558
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,089
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,937
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	16
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	101

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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	66,558	88,684	74.12%	67.81%	75.05%	Met target	No Slippage

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,089	88,684	8.37%	8.61%	7.99%	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]	2,054	88,684	2.31%	2.68%	2.32%	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 ED*Facts* 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	Target >=	36.52%	46.86%	46.86%	47.75%	48.65%
A	Data	52.05%	50.69%	50.73%	48.97%	49.27%
B	Target <=	41.15%	32.67%	32.67%	32.34%	32.00%
B	Data	29.76%	31.14%	31.66%	31.67%	31.38%
C	Target <=		0.31%	0.31%	0.30%	0.29%
C	Data		0.31%	0.27%	0.15%	0.09%

6 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for review. The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all

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

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

6 – Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baselines 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	2024	2025
Target A >=	50.43%	54.00%
Target B <=	31.34%	30.00%

6 – Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.28%	0.24%

6 – Prepopulated Data

6 – Data Source

SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

6 – Date

07/30/2025

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 – Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,544	3,980	1,100	7,624
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	1,068	1,957	554	3,579
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	980	1,253	306	2,539
b2. Number of children attending separate school	67	72	16	155
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	4	2	2	8

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 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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	3,579	7,624	49.27%	50.43%	46.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	2,694	7,624	31.38%	31.34%	35.34%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	8	7,624	0.09%	0.28%	0.10%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable

1. State funding for regular ed preschool does not meet current needs or demands, which resulted in fewer regular education classrooms.
2. Some LEAs did training on how to correctly identify the environment for students, which improved accuracy and impacted data.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

1. State funding for regular ed preschool does not meet current needs or demands, which resulted in fewer regular education classrooms.
2. Some LEAs did training on how to correctly identify the environment for students, which improved accuracy and impacted data.

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

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A1	2018	Target >=	95.30%	88.86%	88.86%	88.94%	89.02%
A1	88.86%	Data	89.18%	91.49%	87.12%	89.23%	90.56%
A2	2018	Target >=	53.13%	55.80%	55.80%	56.33%	56.85%
A2	58.94%	Data	57.20%	57.83%	49.20%	49.28%	50.19%
B1	2018	Target >=	93.41%	88.41%	88.41%	88.73%	89.06%
B1	88.41%	Data	90.04%	92.26%	89.09%	91.32%	91.58%
B2	2018	Target >=	48.91%	48.48%	48.48%	48.80%	49.11%
B2	50.48%	Data	48.70%	49.86%	39.48%	40.53%	44.04%
C1	2018	Target >=	94.12%	89.86%	89.86%	90.00%	90.15%
C1	86.86%	Data	89.68%	92.23%	86.43%	89.77%	90.53%
C2	2018	Target >=	67.41%	66.44%	66.44%	67.01%	67.58%
C2	70.52%	Data	66.95%	68.44%	53.78%	53.61%	54.06%

7 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	89.18%	89.50%
Target A2 >=	57.90%	60.00%
Target B1 >=	89.71%	91.00%
Target B2 >=	49.74%	51.00%
Target C1 >=	90.43%	91.00%
Target C2 >=	68.72%	71.00%

7 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.

- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

7 – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,799

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	7	0.18%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	302	7.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,554	40.91%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,592	41.91%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	344	9.06%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3,146	3,455	90.56%	89.18%	91.06%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	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. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,936	3,799	50.19%	57.90%	50.96%	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	9	0.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	286	7.53%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,781	46.88%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,578	41.54%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	145	3.82%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3,359	3,654	91.58%	89.71%	91.93%	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. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,723	3,799	44.04%	49.74%	45.35%	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	7	0.18%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	302	7.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,364	35.90%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,855	48.83%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	271	7.13%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3,219	3,528	90.53%	90.43%	91.24%	Met 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. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,126	3,799	54.06%	68.72%	55.96%	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.

Indicator 7 early childhood outcomes data is collected in the UPOD module of the UPIPS tool. Teachers gather and input entry and exit outcome scores, along with the name of the assessment tool utilized, into UPOD when a student enters special education preschool services and again when the student exits special education preschool services, such as when the student transitions from preschool to kindergarten. The data collected is generated in a report the USBE uses to complete the SPP/APR for this indicator.

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 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 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 for 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 Program (Utah’s Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all

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

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

8 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	78.38%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	81.33%	78.38%	78.38%	78.58%	78.79%
Data	78.84%	78.56%	80.10%	77.29%	82.04%

8 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	79.19%	80.00%

8 – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
1,761	2,176	82.04%	79.19%	80.93%	Met target	No Slippage

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 students with disabilities who are on the LEA's student list. The parent survey sample is based on the number of students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA. Parents who receive the survey are determined based on a statistical sampling of the LEA, including parents of both preschool and school-age students with disabilities. The contact information provided by the LEA is sorted based on student grade, least restrictive environment code, and disability category. The sorted data is used to gather a representative sample of the LEA. The student data sorting procedure ensures that parents from all student groups are represented in the sample. All parents receive the same survey. Survey collection procedures ensure both preschool and school-age students are represented in an equitable way. Please refer to the "sampling methodology" 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 utilizes the expertise of an external, contracted statistician to aggregate the data, thereby increasing the validity and reliability of the results.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

7,812

Percentage of respondent parents

27.85%

8 – Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	27.74%	27.85%

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 percentage point discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the 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 race/ethnicity and grade group demographics of students receiving special education services to the students for whom parents responded using a +/- three percentage point discrepancy to identify over-or under-representation.

Using this methodology for the grade group analysis, the demographics of the students for whom parents responded are representative as all grade groups were within the 3 percentage point discrepancy margin.

However, for the race/ethnicity analysis, the demographics of the students for whom the parents responded are not representative. Of the students receiving special education services, 67.14% are White and 22.74% are Hispanic. Of the students for whom parents responded, 77.98% are White and 15.96% are Hispanic. All other racial/ethnic groups were within the three percentage point discrepancy margin.

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 continually working to increase engagement from parents from the Hispanic community. Although the percentages of respondents from the other minority racial/ethnic groups were within the 3 percentage point discrepancy margin, the USBE is also working to increase engagement from parents from these communities. To strengthen its relationship with these communities, the USBE Special Education Services section is leading efforts to collaborate with LEAs as well as other USBE sections, teams, and committees to conduct targeted outreach through focus groups and home or community visits in collaboration with LEAs.

The USBE provides coaching and mentorship to LEAs in need of support to increase family engagement and is currently helping a LEA make a plan to strengthen its partnership with Native American families.

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

When seeking to increase the response rate to the Indicator 8 survey, the USBE first sought to support LEAs through professional learning on overall best practices for management of family contact information and how to contact families to foster a positive home and school partnership. Topics include establishing a policy on when families should notify the school of a change in contact information, integrating the updating of contact information into school-day operations, and communicating to families the importance of maintaining up-to-date records. The USBE reduced the LEA burden by obtaining the parent contact information and having the LEAs verify it. LEAs responded positively to this change, and were also more engaged during the survey administration, resulting in being prepared to discuss the purpose of the survey with families. Finally, the USBE also created an Indicator 8 toolkit, which provided a technical assistance document for LEAs and new Special Education Directors to build their skills and awareness of the Indicator 8 survey. Through the toolkit, disseminated to LEA leadership for use at the local level by administrators and teachers, LEA staff were also able to access handouts, graphics, and other resources to engage families and build awareness of the survey, how to complete it, and its significance for their families and the LEA. The USBE will continue to design and utilize graphics for social media going forward to support a state campaign highlighting the significance of the survey for the broader community. Professional learning for LEAs has also been embedded into multiple topics from preschool through 12th grade to ensure that data collected from the Indicator 8 survey is used throughout the state and across programs intentionally and meaningfully to improve the academic and social outcomes for SWD. LEA leaders will also have access to technical assistance and will be able to request professional learning for themselves and their teams to support LEA-wide data-informed goals and better utilize stakeholder input to improve their positive parent involvement score.

Targeted outreach to underrepresented communities will employ a strategic and personalized approach to connect with specific groups. This will include outreach to families in rural parts of the state and to families living on reservations. This will be conducted by increasing the presence of the USBE and building trust through relationship building with the LEAs. The USBE is working towards hosting regional events and identifying community leaders to collaborate, based on input gathered from the LEAs during an initial needs assessment and planning meeting.

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.

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and nonrespondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. Utah's relatively high response rate of 28% reduces the potential for nonresponse bias, but it can still occur if certain subgroups are underrepresented. Significant differences in response rates by race/ethnicity indicate that some student groups are systematically underrepresented. However, there were

no significant differences in the parent involvement scores between parents of White students and parents of Hispanic students.

Those who do respond later in the process may differ in some meaningful way from those who respond early. Access to transportation or a post office may impact their ability to respond promptly, especially for those living in rural communities. The results showed no statistically significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later.

Since no significant differences were found between respondents of contrasting student groups, the USBE has concluded that nonresponse bias is not present.

Additionally, to increase the response rate and reduce potential nonresponse bias, the survey has been provided in both a paper format available in multiple languages and an electronic format available in English and Spanish.

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.

A new sampling plan was instituted in 2014–15 by the USBE and was approved by OSEP. All LEAs are divided into two rotating cohorts 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 randomly assigned to one of the two cohorts. Each of the two cohorts includes large, medium, and small LEAs.

A list of students with IEPs as of December 1 of the current school year is pulled from the state data system and provided to the USBE contracted statistician to produce a sample list and prepare for surveying and compiling results.

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

For LEAs that have more than 100 students, a sample of parents is chosen to receive the survey. The population is 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 (i.e., an LEA that had four times as many students with disabilities 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” to 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” to any item, the survey has not met the indicator requirements.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	N/A

8 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The USBE sends a survey introduction letter, a survey, and a business reply envelope (for parents to submit completed, mailed surveys) through the U.S. Postal Service or email 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 one 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 the survey closes.

LEAs were provided with suggested strategies for communicating with parents, utilizing best practices to ensure parents are aware of the survey's purpose, the use of collected data, and how to access the survey or find support regarding it.

The USBE again made the survey available in electronic format. The electronic version of the survey was sent to all parents who provided their email addresses and whose primary language was either English or Spanish. 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 and produces a spreadsheet of parent responses. The OMR and Qualtrics survey data are merged into a single spreadsheet, which is securely provided to the USBE contracted statistician, who calculates the results.

8 – Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 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.

8 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

An explanation of the State's analyses of representativeness of the respondents is included above.

8 – OSEP Response

None

8 – Required Actions

In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2025 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 = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established } n \text{ and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right) \times 100 \right]$

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 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

9 – Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	1.44%	0.00%	2.10%

9 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

9 – FFY 2024 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.

9

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
4	1	146	2.10%	0%	0.68%	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 (WRR) 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.

For FFY 2024, Indicator 9 used SY 24–25 data. There were 155 LEAs open in Utah in SY 24–25. The USBE calculated a weighted risk ratio for every racial/ethnic group (analysis group) in each LEA based on their identification rates. Of the 155 LEAs, 146 met the minimum n- and cell size

requirements to receive a final weighted risk ratio. Of these 146 LEAs, four had a WRR that met or exceeded the 3.00 threshold and were 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 were required to complete a 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 group(s). The USBE determined an LEA had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification when any level of noncompliance was identified by the USBE during the review of the LEA's self-assessment.

9 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The LEAs determined to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification were 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 noncompliance was verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01.

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

9 – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2023, the USBE required each of the three LEAs with noncompliance to submit one new file in the UPIPS tool. The LEAs were asked to provide a file for a student not already reviewed in the self-assessment. If the new file was not compliant, the LEA was given individual technical assistance and was required to correct the noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified each of the three LEAs is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEA 1: 1 case; the IEP team met and determined the student was no longer eligible for special education services. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 1 case; the student graduated from high school and was no longer eligible for special education services. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated graduation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 1 case; the IEP team met and redetermined eligibility for the student using updated data. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

9 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

9 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the three districts identified in FFY 2023 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 34 C.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 district and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child., consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 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 2023. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

9 – OSEP Response

None

9 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the one district identified in FFY 2024 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.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 district and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child., consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 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 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification)}}{\text{(\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

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 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	5.69%	4.96%	3.25%

10 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

10 – FFY 2024 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.

28

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
25	5	127	3.25%	0%	3.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The LEAS identified with inappropriate identification in FFY 2024 are completely unique. They have not been identified previously. Fewer LEAs had disproportionate representation of

racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories than in FFY 2023, but more were identified with inappropriate identification.

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 WRR 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.

For FFY 2024, Indicator 10 used school year (SY) 2024–2025 data. There were 155 LEAs open in Utah in 2024–2025. The USBE calculated a WRR for every racial/ethnic group and disability category combination (analysis group) in each LEA based on the LEA’s identification rates. Each LEA could have up to 42 risk ratios calculated—one for each of the seven racial/ethnic groups times the six primary disability categories (analysis groups). However, many LEAs in Utah have zero students in many of the analysis groups. In total, across the 155 LEAs, there were 2,616 analysis groups, with 973 (37.2%) meeting the minimum n- and cell sizes.

Of the 155 LEAs, 127 met the minimum n- and cell size requirements to receive a final WRR for at least one analysis group. Of these 127 LEAs, 25 had a WRR for at least one analysis group that met or exceeded the 3.00 threshold and were flagged for disproportionate representation in specific disability categories.

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 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 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 noncompliance will be verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01.

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

10 – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2023, the USBE required each of the four LEAs with noncompliance to submit one new file in the UPIPS tool. 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 were provided professional learning related to the pattern area. If the new file was not compliant, the LEA was given individual technical assistance and was required to correct the noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the updated data and professional learning outcomes and verified each of the four LEAs is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEA 1: 1 case; the LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 4 cases

- Student 1: The student moved and was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. However, the LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the retained copies of the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction, consistent with QA 23-01.
- Student 2: The IEP team met and redetermined eligibility for the student using updated data. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
- Student 3: The LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
- Student 4: The LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction, consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 1 case; the IEP team met and redetermined eligibility for the student using updated data. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 2 cases

- Student 1: The LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
- Student 2: The IEP team met and determined that the student was no longer eligible for special education services. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

10 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

10 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the four districts identified in FFY 2023 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 34 C.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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 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 2023. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

10 – OSEP Response

None

10 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2025 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the five districts identified in FFY 2024 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 34 C.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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 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 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 – Indicator Data

11 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	96.21%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.10%	97.44%	96.24%	90.79%	87.06%

11 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

11 – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
468	428	87.06%	100%	91.45%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

40

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 days beyond the 45-school-day timeline range between 1–8 school days after the initial 45-school-day allocation. In the UIPS tool, if an LEA does not complete all the assessments for

which consent was received during the initial 45-school-day range, the timeline is automatically set to 46 school days and marked as noncompliant. This is because Utah determines that an evaluation is complete when all assessments that consent was given for are completed. Even if an LEA holds an eligibility meeting, the evaluation may still not be complete if tests for which consent was given are not completed. Most of the timelines that were marked as one day past the timeline were marked as being beyond range by one day for this reason. The other reasons for the delay include parents not completing questionnaires on time, availability of contracted service providers, and taking too long to administer the assessments.

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).

Rules II.D. establish that the initial evaluation must be conducted within 45 school days of receiving parental consent or student consent if the student is an adult. There are four exceptions to the initial timeline evaluation:

- 1) The parent of a student repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the student for the evaluation; or
- 2) The student who is an adult repeatedly fails or refuses to participate in evaluation activities; or
- 3) 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.
- 4) The exception in 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.

In FFY 2024, no initial evaluations were delayed due to one of the exceptions outlined above.

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 file reviews during program monitoring visits and during Indicator 11 reviews focused on reviewing files for initial evaluation compliance. All LEAs receive a program monitoring visit at least once every six years. All file reviews were completed using the UPIPS tool.

Program monitoring visits took place onsite at the LEA and involved a review of the complete special education file for students. The number of files selected by the USBE for a program monitoring review was based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and may have included a small number of initial evaluations. The total number of files reviewed depended on the size of the LEA. LEA special education directors were encouraged to invite staff

to participate in and receive TA and coaching during the review process. All Indicator 11 data that came from a program monitoring visit in FFY 2024 are included in this SPP/APR.

Most of the Indicator 11 data were collected during Indicator 11 reviews. In FFY 2024, the four largest LEAs were divided into two cohorts to receive an Indicator 11 file review every other year in conjunction with an Indicator 13 review. The remaining LEAs were divided into three cohorts to receive an Indicator 11 file review every three years in conjunction with an Indicator 13 review. 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 three cohorts. The USBE statistician helped compile the cohort list of LEAs to ensure each of the three cohorts included large, medium, and small LEAs. If a LEA was selected for a program monitoring visit the same year its cohort was selected for Indicator 11 and 13 reviews, Indicator 11 data were collected during the program monitoring visit. During an Indicator 11 review, the USBE reviewed up to 10 initial evaluation timelines. If the LEA had fewer than 10 initial evaluations completed within the current or previous school year, the USBE reviewed all the initial evaluations the LEA had. If a LEA did not have any initial evaluations completed within the current or previous school year, the USBE did not conduct an Indicator 11 review. The LEA selected which files were reviewed by the USBE. Indicator 11 reviews were conducted virtually with the LEA screen sharing while a USBE reviewer entered the data into the UPIPS tool.

11 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
41	41	0	0

11 – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

- LEA 1 provided two new files from the same special education (sped) teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.
- LEA 2 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.
- LEA 3 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 4 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 5 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 6 provided seven new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 7 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 8 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 9 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 10 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 11 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 12 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 13 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 14 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 15 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 16 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 17 provided four new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 18 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 19 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 20 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 21 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 22 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 23 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 24 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 25 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 26 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 27 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 28 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 29 provided eight new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 30 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 31 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 32 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 33 provided three new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 34 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 35 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 36 provided four new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 37 provided two new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 38 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 39 provided four new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluations were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 40 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 41 provided one new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the evaluation was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

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

LEA 1: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 2: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 3: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 4: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 5: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 6: 7 cases; the USBE reviewed the seven files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 7: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 8: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 9: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 10: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 11: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 12: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 13: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 14: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 15: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 16: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 17: 4 cases; the USBE reviewed the four files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 18: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 19: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 20: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 21: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 22: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 23: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 24: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 25: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 26: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 27: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 28: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 29: 8 cases; the USBE reviewed the eight files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 30: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 31: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 32: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 33: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 34: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 35: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 36: 4 cases; the USBE reviewed the four files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 37: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 38: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 39: 4 cases; the USBE reviewed the four files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 40: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 41: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

11 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

11 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

11 – OSEP Response

None

11 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34CFR §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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.08%	95.76%	99.16%	99.57%	99.81%

12 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

12 – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Description	Number
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,637
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	512
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,892
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.	197

Description	Number
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	30
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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 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.	1,892	1,898	99.81%	100%	99.68%	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

6

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.

LEA 1: Two IEPs were late due to the IEP team not scheduling in time. One IEP was completed five days beyond the student's third birthday. The second IEP was completed two days beyond the student's third birthday.

LEA 2: One IEP was late due to the eligibility team not communicating evaluation results and holding an eligibility meeting with the full team. The student was determined ineligible 129 days beyond the student's third birthday.

LEA 3: Two IEPs were completed late due to the LEA wanting to do additional testing. One IEP was completed 65 days beyond the student's third birthday. The second IEP was completed 49 days beyond the student's third birthday. One additional student was incomplete with no eligibility information when the report was generated. Further inquiry determined that the LEA was unable to contact the parents and, therefore, unable to complete eligibility.

Attach PDF table (optional)

N/A

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 TEDI program has been fully operational since FFY 2009. TEDI accesses BTOTS, 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 Part B. 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 for Part B. The Part C database and 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 Part B.

TEDI provides the USBE and the LEAs with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Part B. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. In reviewing LEA data on this indicator, the USBE followed guidance provided in the OSEP QA 23-01 document.

12 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

12 – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2023, the USBE required each of the four LEAs with noncompliance to provide one new file for review for another student served by Part C and found eligible for Part B. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist also completed a fidelity checklist of the Part C to Part B transition process with each LEA. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified each of the four LEAs is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEA 1: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

LEA 2: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

LEA 3: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

LEA 4: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

12 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

12 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

12 – OSEP Response

None

12 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority)}}{\text{(\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)}} \right] \times 100$.

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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 – Indicator Data

13 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	69.13%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	52.10%	69.13%	69.39%	52.44%	61.74%

13 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

13 – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
339	490	61.74%	100%	69.18%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 file reviews during program monitoring visits and during Indicator 13 reviews focused on reviewing PST plans for compliance. All LEAs receive a program monitoring visit at least once every six years. All file reviews were completed using the UPIPS tool.

Program monitoring visits took place onsite at the LEA and involved a review of the complete special education file for students, as selected by the USBE. The number of files selected for a program monitoring review was based on a statistical ratio of the LEA's special education population and included PST plans, if available. The total number of files reviewed depended on the size of the LEA. LEA special education directors were encouraged to invite staff to participate in and receive TA and coaching during the review process. All Indicator 13 data that came from a program monitoring visit in FFY 2024 are included in this SPP/APR.

Most of the Indicator 13 data were collected during Indicator 13 reviews. In FFY 2024, the four largest LEAs were divided into two cohorts to receive an Indicator 13 review every other year in conjunction with an Indicator 11 review. The remaining LEAs were divided into three cohorts to receive an Indicator 13 file review every three years in conjunction with an Indicator 11 review. 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 three cohorts. The USBE statistician helped compile the cohort list of LEAs to ensure each of the three cohorts included large, medium, and small LEAs. If a LEA was selected for a program monitoring visit the same year its cohort was selected for Indicator 11 and 13 reviews, Indicator 13 data were collected during the program monitoring visit. During an Indicator 13 review, the USBE reviewed up to 10 PST plans. If the LEA had fewer than 10 PST plans, the USBE reviewed all the PST plans the LEA had. If a LEA did not serve secondary students, the USBE did not conduct an Indicator 13 review at the LEA. The LEA selected which files were reviewed by the USBE. Indicator 13 reviews were conducted virtually with the LEA screen sharing while a USBE reviewer entered the data into the UPIPS tool.

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 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
54	54	0	0

13 – FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2023, each LEA with noncompliance was required to provide new PST plans to demonstrate the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. Each LEA was required to provide a specific number of new PST plans based on the number that were identified as noncompliant. The percentage of new PST plans was determined by the number of individual cases of noncompliance within the LEA. For each 10% below 100% compliant, the LEA was required to submit one new PST plan via the UIPS tool. For example, if a LEA was 80% compliant, the LEA was required to submit two new PST plans. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEA 1: 1 case; amended the postsecondary transition plan (PSTP) or held IEP meeting (mtg) and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 5: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 6: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 7: 16 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 8: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 9: 9 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 10: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 11: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 12: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 13: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 14: 2 cases; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 15: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 16: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 17: 7 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 18: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 19: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 20: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 21: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 22: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 23: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 24: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 25: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 26: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 27: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 28: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 29: 10 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 30: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 31: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 32: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 33: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 34: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 35: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 36: 11 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 37: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 38: 10 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 39: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 40: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 41: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 42: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 43: 7 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 44: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 45: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 46: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 47: 9 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 48: 10 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 49: 9 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 50: 7 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 51: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 52: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 53: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 54: 8 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The USBE does not permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding.

13 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

13 – Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Correction of noncompliance information is included in the section titled Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023.

13 – OSEP Response

None

13 – Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 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 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

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 2025 on students who left school during 2023-2024, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2023-2024 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.

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).

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 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 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.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2018	Target >=	29.75%	17.62%	17.62%	18.29%	18.97%
A	19.62%	Data	19.39%	17.88%	19.70%	17.87%	17.26%
B	2018	Target >=	85.07%	65.50%	65.50%	65.81%	66.13%
B	67.60%	Data	60.56%	65.55%	66.31%	65.39%	60.88%
C	2018	Target >=	99.83%	82.37%	82.37%	82.70%	83.03%
C	84.37%	Data	83.37%	82.82%	82.74%	83.68%	80.78%

14 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	20.31%	23.00%
Target B >=	66.75%	68.00%
Target C >=	83.69%	85.00%

14 – Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

14 – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Description	Data
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	4,951
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,569
Response Rate	51.89%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	507
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,033
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)	262
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).	216

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	507	2,569	17.26%	20.31%	19.74%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,540	2,569	60.88%	66.75%	59.95%	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)	2,018	2,569	80.78%	83.69%	78.55%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	The rate of respondents competitively employed was 40.21%, a decrease from 43.62% last year. The rate of respondents with specific learning disabilities (SLD) competitively employed also decreased to 48.55% from 51.69% last year. Respondents with SLD typically show the highest outcomes in this area. The decrease in employment outcomes for this student group paired with lower representation of this student group in this year's sample helps explain the slippage in the C category. Additionally, the combined rate of respondents enrolled in other postsecondary education and other employment decreased to 18.61% from 19.91% last year. The overall response rate for the Indicator 14 survey decreased to 51.89% from 53.65% last year. This year's survey showed a decrease in respondents who exited with the alternate diploma to 1.87% from 2.61% last year. The rate of respondents who exited with a certificate of completion increased slightly to 4.01% from 3.61% last year. The rate of respondents that reported not working at all since exiting school increased to 24% from 21% last year. Reasons reported for not being engaged in employment included doing something else first or in school (16%, decreased from 20% last year) and some other health or disability related reason (31%, decreased from 34% last year). This year, 10% of respondents stated they were unable to find work, which is an increase from 7% last year. The rate of respondents reporting they lacked the necessary skills and qualifications decreased to 7% from 9% last year. According to the Utah State Office of Rehabilitation, while Utah's unemployment rate is lower than the national average, individuals seeking entry-level positions are facing more competition from older workers who are staying in or re-entering the workforce. Additionally, due to economic conditions, more adults are securing secondary employment, which makes it more challenging for high school graduates, especially those with disabilities, to stand out. There is also a growing expectation for skills and experience, even for entry-level positions.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

14 – Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	53.65%	51.89%

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 percentage point discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group was used to determine representativeness of the demographics listed on the [Utah 2025 Statewide Demographics Report of 2023–2024 Exiters with Disabilities](#)

(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uN7Rrd3SVv1QMZxUiYXQBu7TmqecM40A/view?usp=sharing>). The demographics report is also attached in EMAPS and included at the end of this report.

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.

As shown in the Utah 2025 Statewide Demographics Report of 2023–2024 Exiters with Disabilities referenced above, the percentages of respondents of all sexes, disability categories, races/ethnicities, diploma/certification types, students who have reached maximum age of eligibility, and students who have dropped out are all within the 3 percentage point discrepancy margin and 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 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.

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 will continue to promote the effectiveness of, and provide training for, LEAs conducting their own surveys rather than relying solely on outside contractors. LEAs with the highest response rates will continue to be recognized during annual statewide meetings with special education directors and stakeholders, sharing steps that were taken by these LEAs, as encouragement and help for other LEAs to improve their response rates. The USBE will continue to work with Utah Adult Education to identify exiters who are enrolled in or have completed an Adult Education Diploma or General Educational Development (GED) to increase understanding of some of the dropout population's outcomes. USBE will continue to conduct communities of practice three times per year to support LEAs with the Indicator 14 survey processes and data analysis. The USBE has included the Indicator 14 survey response rate as part of its new LEA annual determination process. The response rate is weighted to make a bigger impact on the LEA annual determinations than other measures.

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 as shown in the Utah 2025 Statewide Demographics Report of 2023-2024 Exiters with Disabilities referenced above as all demographic groups were within the +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy margin.

The USBE will use the strategies described above to promote a continued 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.

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)

None

14 – Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 14 attachments included in the State's FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachments available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

14 – Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

The referenced attachments were made available to the public July 2, 2025.

14 – OSEP Response

None

14 – Required Actions

None

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

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specifications FS229.

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 baselines 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

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

15 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution – Due Process Complaints (EDFacts file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	7
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution – Due Process Complaints (EDFacts file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	2

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 for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.

- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

15 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	44.44%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Data	80.00%	37.50%	33.33%	50.00%	25.00%

15 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	N/A	N/A

15 – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
2	7	25.00%	N/A	28.57%	N/A	N/A

15 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

15 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 – OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2024. 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

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS228.

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 baselines 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

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

16 – Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution – Mediation Requests (EDFacts file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1 Mediations held	17
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution – Mediation Requests (EDFacts file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution – Mediation Requests (EDFacts file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5

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 for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.

- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

16 –Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	68.75%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	60.00%	60.25%	60.50%	60.75%	61.00%
Data	62.50%	84.62%	45.45%	66.67%	61.54%

16 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	61.25%	61.50%

16 – FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
3	5	17	61.54%	61.25%	47.06%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Although Utah received fewer mediation requests overall in FFY 2024 (25) than in FFY 2023 (27), more mediations were held (17 in FFY 2024, 13 in FFY 2023). While the number of mediations held related to due process complaints increased (7 in FFY 2024, 2 in FFY 2023), the percentage that resulted in an agreement decreased (42.85% in FFY 2024, 50.00% in FFY 2023). It seems parties may have been filing for due process and requesting mediation or agreeing to mediation without the good faith intention of resolving without a hearing. Utah's increase in due process filings aligns with the national trend of increased dispute resolution filings overall per the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education. The content of mediation agreements is confidential and the USBE does not have access to a variety of data points that might help us better understand why some mediations are successful and others are not. One data point we do have is whether the parties were represented by counsel. Of eight mediations where parties were represented by legal counsel or an advocate at the time of filing, four resulted in an agreement and four did not. Thus, this does not seem to be a contributing factor.

Potential outside contributing factors could be the increasing contentiousness of society in general. The increased population in Utah and hybrid work could be changing the dynamics and demographic groups filing IDEA disputes from previous years.

16 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

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

Results indicator: 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.

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.

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, 2025). 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 2024 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026).

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 2024 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026) 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 PSO 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 PSO survey who were enrolled as “super seniors” at the time 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 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.

Utah’s current [theory of action](#) is located at

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

Current Relationship	FFY	2024	2025
Data must be less than or equal to the target	Target	35.65%	25.65%

17 – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of PSO Survey Respondents ages 19–22 (super seniors) Reporting as Under-engaged or Disengaged	Total Number of PSO Survey Respondents ages 19–22 (super seniors)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
183	350	40.74%	35.65%	52.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The rate of respondents competitively employed was 40.21%, a decrease from 43.62% last year. The rate of respondents enrolled in other postsecondary education and other employment combined decreased to 18.61% from 19.91% last year. The rate of respondents with SLD who

were competitively employed decreased to 48.55% from 51.69% last year. Respondents with SLD typically show the highest rates of competitive employment. The decrease in employment outcomes for this student group paired with the lower representation of this group in this year's sample helps explain the slippage. In addition to the decrease in respondents with SLD, the number of respondents with intellectual disability (ID), autism, and multiple disabilities (MD) increased. Respondents with these disabilities typically report lower post school outcomes.

The overall response rate for the PSO survey decreased to 51.89% from 53.65% last year. This year's survey showed an increase in the rate of respondents who exited with a certificate of completion to 4.01% from 3.61% last year.

The rate of respondents that reported not working at all since exiting school increased to 24% from 21% last year. This year, 10% of respondents stated they were unable to find work, which is an increase from 7% last year.

According to the Department of Workforce Services (DWS) Office of Rehabilitative Services, while Utah's unemployment rate is lower than the national average, individuals seeking entry-level positions are facing more competition from older workers who are staying in or re-entering the workforce. Additionally, due to economic conditions, more adults are securing secondary employment, which makes it more challenging for high school graduates/completers, especially those with disabilities, to stand out. There is also a growing expectation for skills and experience, even for entry-level positions.

Systems change implementation efforts typically take several years before their effects can be seen in the outcome data. Initial efforts may spike positive outcomes due to increased awareness, but lasting change takes time. It was previously asserted that increased interagency collaboration and awareness of available services related to the SSIP broad improvement strategies and the work of the STC may have had a positive effect on student outcomes. This may still be the case. However, long-term systems change efforts are still in process and have not been fully implemented which could account for some of the fluctuation in the data. Additionally, the sample of respondents in this population changed significantly in 2025. The decrease in employment outcomes for all student groups paired with a lower representation of the SLD group and higher representation of the ID, autism, and MD groups in this year's sample will affect the data negatively.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2024 data.

The data was gathered from the 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, which 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.

Utah's current [evaluation plan](https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/_specialeducation/_datareporting/_apr-spp-ssip/_ssipevaluationplan/Data2026JanuarySSIPEvaluationPlan.pdf) is located at:

https://www.schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/_specialeducation/_datareporting/_apr-spp-ssip/_ssipevaluationplan/Data2026JanuarySSIPEvaluationPlan.pdf.

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 PST 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 support for youth and families, smooth flow of services, and coordination of services. The STC was split into three subcommittees to implement the broad improvement strategies. The Theory of Action then demonstrated how each broad improvement strategy leveraged the strengths of the 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. PL for educators.

- Improve LEA attendance and participation in the annual Postsecondary Transition Institute (TI) for educators. The TI 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 PST planning for SWD as mandated in the 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 UPC.
- Improve enrollment in Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) for SWD through vocational rehabilitation (VR).

- Improve utilization of the Transition Elevated planning app among SWD as they participate in the development of their own IEP PST 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 the USBE, 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 PST 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 PST and a glossary of terms.
 - Build a website to house the vision and resources for PST 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 PST service providers and its efforts to build capacity to assist LEAs to improve outcomes for SWD and evaluate the impact of Utah's improvement efforts. These improvement efforts align with the IDEA and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The success of the SSIP requires systematic improvement across the USBE, LEAs, and 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 PST 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 and 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 PST planning.

These combined efforts will lead to improved PST planning for SWD, which in turn will improve state results in graduation, dropout, and PSO in employment and higher education 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) In June 2025, the annual TI hosted 365 total participants, with 134 representing 40 LEA teams. Plans from 31 LEA teams were submitted to the USBE PST Specialists for review. Team plan themes included increased career preparation/exploration, graduation rate, collaboration (e.g., VR, school counseling), college readiness, employment, Indicator 13 compliance, parent engagement, PSO Survey, Pre-ETS, self-determination/self-advocacy, and student-led IEPs. Support is provided to team leaders throughout the year through VCoP sessions providing TA and support for PST team plan implementation, PST-related topics relevant to the team plans, and networking/sharing successes and barriers in PST team planning.
- 2) The Supports for Youth and Families Workgroup (SYFW) analyzed previous years' feedback from the TI for patterns that might inform better attendance from youth and families, how to attract new teams while keeping seasoned teams engaged, how to increase participation with CTE, and more effective team planning time. Themes were identified and shared with the TI planning team for use in 2026.
- 3) The SYFW created a brochure that was distributed to educators and families from the STC as a unified collaborative endorsing Pre-ETS services opportunities for youth and families.
- 4) Six youth with disabilities and 266 family members were trained using the Transition University curriculum between July 1, 2024, and June 30, 2025. This is a decrease over the last reporting period. The UPC has also begun collecting knowledge gain data from their

workshops. Only one workshop reported knowledge gain using pre/post measures this reporting period with an 8 percentage point increase.

- 5) During SY 24–25, 39,291 transition-age youth were served in special education or had 504 Plans in place, making them potentially eligible for Pre-ETS services. From July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025, 14,541 (37.01%) students accessed Pre-ETS services.

(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 Plan. Those students who qualify for Pre-ETS without an IEP or 504 Plan 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 and remains consistent with the data collected and reported in the baseline year.)

- 6) In SY 24–25, 2,014 students used the Transition Elevated planning app.
- 7) The study to explore the practices of schools with consistent representation of SWD in CTE and those with underrepresentation of SWD in CTE to identify patterns of practices that may inform TA and PL efforts for improvement was completed this year. Three strategic opportunities were identified to improve representation of SWD in CTE in Utah: 1) raise CTE awareness among students and educators, 2) improve CTE access and inclusion through classroom supports and accommodations, and 3) build capacity and collaboration through PL and data-driven decision making.

SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES

- 1) This committee reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) used by the State of Maine and has drafted a similar MOU for Utah for the DWS, DHHS, and the USBE. This draft has been proposed to leadership of the three agencies for review and to begin the approval process.
- 2) Interviews with PSO survey respondents to examine service patterns over time for those who reported being engaged in meaningful post school activities and for those who reported being under-engaged or unengaged were postponed to implement a more reliable means to contact possible interviewees and improve sample size for this exploration. A question asking for interest in an interview or focus group and requesting contact information for that purpose was added to the PSO survey. The USBE will collect this information for an additional survey year before performing student interviews/focus groups.
- 3) A draft of the Portrait of Secondary Transition has been completed – identifying 11 categories of opportunities, experiences, and skills that SWDs need to meet the competencies listed in Utah’s Portrait of a Graduate. The 11 categories have been operationally defined and mapped onto the Mastery, Autonomy, and Purpose themes in Portrait of a Graduate.

COORDINATION OF SERVICES

- 1) The STC Agency Collaboration Workgroup piloted the universal referral form with a few LEAs to use when referring students to services from other providers. This system-wide referral form was created to simplify the process for SWD, their families, and service providers as the first step in coming together as a statewide system of PST stakeholders. The feedback

showed a need for implementing a referral process rather than a single form. We have discontinued the form and have begun creating a process in line with the draft MOU.

- 2) A one-stop PST website for Utah launched in August 2024, www.utahtransitionelevated.org. The STC Agency Collaboration Workgroup acted as the stakeholder group to ensure content represented the statewide system of PST rather than one or two individual agencies. The website was updated this year to make it accessible and more user-friendly. The website is being promoted via individual outreach to LEAs, parent organizations, and public social media to ensure students, families, and educators are aware of this resource.

These strategies support systems change as more stakeholders will understand the tenets of PST and barriers to services are addressed through deliberate collaboration. These outcomes will lead to SiMR achievement and support efforts to scale-up and 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 and improve PSO for SWD as educators, students, and families get training and support in PST planning and services and service providers work together to create a unified system of PST 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 TI feedback analysis into future TI planning to improve the content to better meet educators' PL needs. Based on this feedback and the slippage in our outcomes, the USBE has decided to change the format for the 2026 TI to support training and teaming regionally to better tailor content to team needs. The content for the TI will focus on supporting students with more complex needs which includes students with autism, ID, and MD. The USBE will continue to build youth and family engagement in the TI. Additional PL and support will be added for all team members (not just team leads) throughout the year.
- 2) Continue to expand the advertising of the TI through new STC channels, targeted social media, and target specific LEAs based on results-driven accountability outcomes related to PST indicators.
- 3) Add a parent and youth evening rather than a track during the TI to improve knowledge and understanding of available resources for family members and SWD.
- 4) Continue to distribute one-page informational flyers and frequently asked questions documents for families about Pre-ETS and other resources available to support successful PST for SWD.
- 5) Update the CDC implementation and support materials to align with Utah's First Credential initiative.

SMOOTH FLOW OF SERVICES

- 1) Create TA for educators based on the results of three studies completed this past year including the CTE study referenced above and the PSO five-year analysis. Share identified themes and patterns to inform the continued development of the Portrait of Secondary Transition for SWD.
- 2) Draft the timeline by grade band for the Portrait of Secondary Transition.

COORDINATION OF SERVICES

- 1) Revise the universal referral process to make it more useful for educators and families.
- 2) Complete the MOU between DWS, DHHS, and the USBE.
- 3) Provide outreach and training on Utah's newly completed PST website for educators, families, and community partners.

The anticipated outcomes in the next reporting period for these strategies are:

- 1) Increase the number of educators and the variety of professionals participating in the TI in LEA teams;
- 2) Increase the number of youth with disabilities and their families participating in the TI, Transition University, and utilizing the Transition Elevated planning app;
- 3) Improve local level data sharing and collaboration between agencies that serve PST-age youth and educators; and
- 4) Continue to collaboratively (across agencies and organizations) develop defined expectations for PST experiences for SWD in Utah.

By achieving these outcomes, Utah will continue to build a statewide system of supports for PST 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 implemented 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 practice.

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., VR, Division of Services for People with Disabilities (DSPD), Providers, CTE) with the common goal to achieve positive and measurable PSO 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: the 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 PST planning (e.g., decision-making, providing support, attending meetings, and advocating for their children) through learning/training opportunities, experiences, and support in PST services. To maximize the power of parent involvement in the PST 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, and <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 PST 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 PST, 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 UPC, has developed a parent and youth workshop series called Transition University. Transition University was developed in 2020 in partnership with various PST stakeholders in the state. The training is comprised of six topics titled 1) Citizenship and Advocacy, 2) Education, Employment, and Daily Life Skills, 3) Self-Determination and Person-Centered Planning, 4) Safety and 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 PST for SWD. Comprehensive student-driven and family-supported PST 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 PST planning, the USBE Special Education Services team developed the Transition Elevated planning app in 2020 for youth and families to enhance preparation for the PST planning IEP process. The App allows students and families to have input in the PST IEP process and includes links to outside agencies, tips for a successful PST IEP meeting, and considers the student's strengths, preferences, interests, and needs. When the student has completed the questions in the App, a draft PST plan is generated for the student and family to share at the PST IEP meeting. Increasing the utilization of this App will encourage student self-advocacy in PST IEP development. When students are involved in their PST planning, they are more motivated to engage in the opportunities, instruction, services, and supports outlined in the PST plan which leads to better postsecondary outcomes.

The UPC 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 PST 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 PST services provided in the areas of self-determination/self-advocacy, community-based instruction, work-based learning, and 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

- The full STC met four times this year, and each committee met eight additional times throughout the year. Representatives from 26 organizations and divisions across multiple interagency departments and eight LEAs participated. The STC piloted the universal referral form and received feedback from educators and VR professionals.

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

- In 2024, 58% of students without disabilities and 47% of SWD concentrated in a CTE pathway; 37% of students without disabilities and 22% of SWD completed a CTE pathway; 52% of students without disabilities and 33% of SWD participated in at least one CTE course. Given that Utah has a graduation requirement for all students to take some CTE courses, these numbers show that SWD access CTE at a much lower rate and CTE courses may be substituted in their schedule more frequently than students without a disability.
- Data was also collected by LEA. Interviews and focus groups were conducted with educators and administrators in targeted LEAs to identify patterns of success and barriers to success in including SWD in CTE pathways. The outcome of this study showed three strategic target areas to improve participation of SWD in CTE: 1) raising CTE awareness with students and educators, 2) improving CTE access and inclusion through classroom supports and accommodations, and 3) building capacity and collaboration through PL and data-driven decision making.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

- Six youth with disabilities and 266 family members were trained using the Transition University curriculum between July 1, 2024, and June 30, 2025. This is a decrease over the last reporting period. The UPC has also begun collecting knowledge gain data from their workshops. Only one workshop reported knowledge gain using pre/post measures this reporting period with an 8 percentage point increase.

SELF-DETERMINATION/SELF-ADVOCACY

- In SY 24–25, 2,014 students used the Transition Elevated planning app.
- Five of 31 teams from the TI chose self-determination or self-advocacy/student-led IEPs as the goal area on their plan.

STUDENT SUPPORT

- Thirty educators completed the PST asynchronous Canvas course.
- Twenty educators participated in the Building Post School Success for Students with Complex Needs webinar series to learn strategies to support students with complex support needs as they prepare for adult life.
- Six of 31 teams from the TI chose PST services and quality PST plans as the goal area on their plan.

PRE-ETS

- During SY 24–25, 39,291 transition-age youth were served in special education or had 504 Plans in place, making them potentially eligible for Pre-ETS services. From July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025, 14,541 (37.01%) students accessed Pre-ETS services. This is an increase over last year.
- The Transition Readiness Toolkit created collaboratively with VR and Utah State University to capture measurable gains scores for students receiving Pre-ETS continues to show consistent skill gains for students receiving Pre-ETS services in Utah. One LEA has been piloting a new educator version of this assessment, the Transition Planning Tool (TPT), to aid in collaboration between educators and Pre-ETS providers as they co-serve students.

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 practice 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 working through the approval process for the MOU 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 at state and local levels. Utah will continue to educate on the one-stop PST 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 PST that all stakeholders can understand. Utah will begin development of a specific youth page on this website.

CTE PATHWAY CONCENTRATION OR COMPLETION

The results of the completed CTE study will be shared with educators, youth, and families to improve utilization of this evidence-based practice for SWD in our state. Utah will begin updating the CDC implementation and TA materials to align with the First Credential initiative.

PARENT TRAINING TO TEACH KNOWLEDGE OF TRANSITION SERVICES

Utah has developed and implemented new marketing materials for families sponsored by the full group of STC stakeholders. The materials include information on Pre-ETS services. Information will continue to 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 then share it with students and families as appropriate. Additionally, Utah will continue the parent and youth information and resource sessions at the annual TI.

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 participation in Transition University. PL in self-determination/self-advocacy continues to increase with modules in the PST Canvas course and the creation of a CoP for middle grade teachers to improve

practices for younger SWD. This will lead to an increase in SWD actively participating in PST planning for their own IEPs.

STUDENT SUPPORT

Utah has analyzed PSO 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 continue to provide TA and PL to educators about the results of this analysis to help improve practice. Utah will also use the results of this analysis to continue development of the Portrait of Secondary Transition emphasizing best practices and a timeline of services for successful outcomes in Utah.

PRE-ETS

As stated above, Utah will continue to disseminate additional simplified marketing materials to help families understand and access Pre-ETS. Pre-ETS services will be highlighted again at the annual TI.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The activity of increasing access to Pre-ETS for SWD is being removed from the SSIP because we met service targets and our VR partners feel they are in a stable place with referrals and services. Rather than measuring the number of youth and families participating in Transition University, the STC has chosen to focus on increasing youth participation. The STC will also start measuring the number of youth and families participating in the annual TI. The STC is moving the focus away from improving data matching to improving interagency collaboration processes at the local level – including creating guidance for best practice in student level data sharing across agencies. Finally, based on educator feedback, the STC is moving away from the implementation of a specific universal referral form and creating guidance based on the MOU for a standardized referral process among participating agencies.

17 – Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

17 – Description of Stakeholder Input

The USBE values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback for 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 Program (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies and nonprofit organizations that provide services to SWD
- Utah educators
- State advocacy groups

During FFY 2024, no changes were made to the SPP/APR targets. The USBE 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; includes all state agencies that serve individuals with disabilities and all nonprofit organizations that receive any state funding and/or grants).

The USBE continued work with stakeholders including parents and advocacy groups across the state on supporting inclusive practices and ensuring SWD are in the LRE. The feedback was used in disseminating the POMI, Implementation Guide, and 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.

The USBE collaborates with LEAs, educators, IHEs, and external stakeholders regarding licensing questions for special education and related services and provides support and TA for teachers on an Alternate Educator License (AEL) path through professional education licensure in special education.

INDICATOR SPECIFIC

INDICATORS 1, 2, 13, & 14

- The USBE special education, family engagement, prevention, attendance, and statewide LEAs collaborate on improving student attendance by providing insight and support towards family engagement and improving postsecondary outcomes for SWD. Ongoing collaboration efforts inform future policies, strategies, and programs across the USBE.
- The USBE continues to facilitate an interagency state PST team as part of Indicator 17 and to improve graduation. The team meets regularly to work on implementation of statewide goals for PST.

INDICATOR 3

- The USBE holds standards and assessments parent review committees to review all assessment items during the item development process for statewide assessments. The parent review committee reviews each item before it is presented to Utah students.
- During the assessment development process for new assessment items, the USBE includes a Fairness and Bias committee. Bias and Fairness participants range from parents, individuals whose primary language is not English, and educators who have expertise in the assessment of SWD. The committee reviews each new assessment item to ensure it is free of barriers for all students.

INDICATORS 6, 7, & 12

- The USBE is included in the Early Childhood Utah Advisory Council as well as the Parent Engagement, Support, and Education subcommittee and shares when appropriate. The USBE is also part of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers, which has multiple parent representatives.

INDICATORS 8, 15, & 16

- Through collaboration with LEAs, UPC, and community partners, USBE feedback is collected on an ongoing basis. The USBE participates on committees and parent workgroups related family engagement.
- The USBE collaborates with UPC to provide information, resources, and TA to parents and families regarding dispute resolution options which impact Indicators 15 and 16. The USBE continues to experience relatively low levels of dispute resolution including mediation, Due Process hearing requests, and resolution meetings.

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 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 PST-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, School Counseling, Teaching and Learning, Youth in Care, and CTE
- UPC
- Utah Statewide Independent Living Council
- Utah Registry of Autism and Developmental Disabilities (URADD)
- Utah PTA
- DWS: Office of Rehabilitative Services, Career and Education Program (WIOA Youth Program), Business Relations for the Employment for People with Disabilities
- DHHS: Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice and Youth Services, 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 (IHC)
- Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (USDB)
- Utah System of Higher Education
- Utah State University Institute for Disability Research, Policy, and Practice

The STC is split into three subcommittees to address 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

17 – 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.

Utah 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.

Utah 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.

Utah 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

Indicator 18: General Supervision

18 – Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

18 – Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

18 – Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification

- a. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2024 submission, use FFY 2023, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)
- b. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

18 – Instructions

Targets must be 100%.

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Report in Column A, the number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024), as reported in the compliance indicator, and report in Column C1, the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance. Report in Column B, the number of additional findings of noncompliance related to the compliance indicator made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) and report in Column C2, the number of those additional findings related

to the compliance indicator which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State’s written notification of noncompliance.

States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

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 findings of 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 and the actions that have been taken or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA’s enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 – Indicator Data

18 – Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	100.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100.00%

18 – Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. 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))

18 – Indicator 4B Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
6	5	6	5	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

The additional findings are from dispute resolution.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

INDICATOR 4B

LEA 1: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination and FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: The USBE conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training participation, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 6: The LEA conducted required training in manifestation determination, FAPE when a student is suspended more than 10 school days, and notification of parent rights through the procedural safeguards. The LEA provided evidence of FAPE, training, and a correct manifestation determination review. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

LEA 1: The LEA received PL on IEP implementation requirements, placement in the least restrictive environment by the IEP team, parent participation in placement decisions, and personnel training and supervision requirements. The LEA reviewed and revised its policies, procedures, and training materials regarding its LRE process and trained staff on the updates. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: The LEA received PL on IDEA discipline requirements and addressing student behavior through positive behavior interventions and supports and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: The LEA received PL on IEP development, review, and revision; functional behavior assessment (FBA); and behavior intervention plan (BIP) and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: The LEA received PL on positive behavioral supports, FBA, and BIP and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: The LEA received PL on FBA, BIP, IEP review and revision, and behavior interventions and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

INDICATOR 4B

LEA 1: 4 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. All four students had transferred out of the LEA. The receiving LEA was provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 16 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. One student had graduated, 12 students had transferred out of the LEA, and

three students were still enrolled. The receiving LEA s for the 12 transfer students was provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The three students who maintained enrollment in the LEA all had current IEPs and were receiving services. Each student was suspended during the school year, but none for more than five school days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 7 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. Four students had transferred out of the LEA and three students were still enrolled. The receiving LEAs for the four transfer students was provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The three students who maintained enrollment in the LEA all had current IEPs and were receiving services. Each student was suspended during the school year. One student was suspended for more than ten days, procedural safeguards were provided, and a manifestation determination review was conducted. Services were provided during the suspension. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 3 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. Two students had transferred out of the LEA, and one student was still enrolled. The receiving LEA s for the two transfer students was provided with student files and information for successful transfer. The one student who maintained enrollment in the LEA was exited from special education and was no longer receiving services. The student was suspended during the school year, but only for seven days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: 3 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. All three students were still enrolled in the LEA. All three students continue to receive special education services and have been suspended during the school year. None of the suspensions exceeded ten days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 6: 2 cases; the LEA reviewed the status of each student to ensure they were receiving a FAPE in SY 23–24. One student had graduated and one was still enrolled. The student who maintained enrollment in the LEA had a current IEP and continued to receive services. The student had suspensions during the school year but did not exceed four school days. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

LEA 1: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 5: The LEA provided compensatory services, conducted a FBA, developed a BIP, and help an IEP meeting to update the IEP. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Indicator 9. 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))

18 – Indicator 9 Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
3	0	3	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

In FFY 2023, the USBE required each of the three LEAs with noncompliance to submit one new file in the UIIPS tool. The LEAs were asked to provide a file for a student not already reviewed in the self-assessment. If the new file was not compliant, the LEA was given individual technical assistance and was required to correct the noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified each of the three LEAs is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

LEA 1: 1 case; the IEP team met and determined the student was no longer eligible for special education services. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 1 case; the student graduated from high school and was no longer eligible for special education services. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated graduation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 1 case; the IEP team met and redetermined eligibility for the student using updated data. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

Indicator 10. 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))

18 – Indicator 10 Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
4	0	4	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

In FFY 2023, the USBE required each of the four LEAs with noncompliance to submit one new file in the UPIPS tool. 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 were provided professional learning related to the pattern area. If the new file was not compliant, the LEA was given individual technical assistance and was required to correct the noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the updated data and professional learning outcomes and verified each of the four LEAs is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

LEA 1: 1 case; the LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 4 cases

- Student 1: The student moved and was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. However, the LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the retained copies of the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
 - Student 2: The IEP team met and redetermined eligibility for the student using updated data. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
 - Student 3: The LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
 - Student 4: The LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
- LEA 3: 1 case; the IEP team met and redetermined eligibility for the student using updated data. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 2 cases

- Student 1: The LEA was able to locate the missing evaluation documentation within the file that had initially warranted the findings of noncompliance. The USBE reviewed the recovered evaluation documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.
- Student 2: The IEP team met and determined that the student was no longer eligible for special education services. The USBE reviewed the LEA's updated eligibility determination documentation and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

Indicator 11. 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))

18 – Indicator 11 Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
41	4	41	4	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

The additional findings are from dispute resolution (DR).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

IND 11

LEA 1 provided 2 new files from the same special education (sped) teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evaluations (evals) were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 2 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 3 provided 2 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 4 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 5 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 6 provided seven new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 7 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 8 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 9 provided 3 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 10 provided 2 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 11 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 12 provided 2 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 13 provided 2 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 14 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 34 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 35 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 36 provided 4 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 37 provided 2 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 38 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 39 provided 4 new files from the same sped teachers. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified evals were completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 40 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

LEA 41 provided 1 new file from the same sped teacher. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified eval was completed within 45 school days from the receipt of consent.

DR

LEA 1 received PL on child find and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is implementing regulatory requirements.

LEA 2 received PL on child find and evaluation timelines and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is implementing regulatory requirements.

LEA 3 funded a comprehensive evaluation. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is implementing regulatory requirements.

LEA 4 received PL on child find and provided evidence of completion. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified the LEA is implementing regulatory requirements.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

IND 11

LEA 1: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 2: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 3: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 4: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 5: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 6: 7 cases; the USBE reviewed the seven files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 7: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 8: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 9: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 10: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 11: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 12: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 13: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 14: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 15: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 16: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 17: 4 cases; the USBE reviewed the four files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 18: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 19: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 20: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 21: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 22: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 23: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 24: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 25: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 26: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 27: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 28: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 29: 8 cases; the USBE reviewed the eight files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 30: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 31: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 32: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 33: 3 cases; the USBE reviewed the three files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 34: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 35: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 36: 4 cases; the USBE reviewed the four files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 37: 2 cases; the USBE reviewed the two files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 38: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 39: 4 cases; the USBE reviewed the four files and verified evaluations were conducted although late.

LEA 40: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

LEA 41: 1 case; the USBE reviewed the file and verified an evaluation was conducted although late.

DR

LEA 1: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 2: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 3: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

LEA 4: The LEA provided compensatory services. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified correction consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Indicator 12. 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))

18 – Indicator 12 Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
4	0	4	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

In FFY 2023, the USBE required each of the four LEAs with noncompliance to provide one new file for review for another student served by Part C and found eligible for Part B. The USBE Special Education Preschool Specialist also completed a fidelity checklist of the Part C to Part B transition process with each LEA. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified each of the four LEAs is correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

LEA 1: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

LEA 2: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

LEA 3: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

LEA 4: 1 case; the USBE met with the LEA and verified the eligibility process had been completed, although late. The student was determined eligible for Part B and the USBE verified an IEP had been developed and was being implemented.

Indicator 13. 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 and 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 a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

18 – Indicator 13 Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
54	0	54	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

In FFY 2023, each LEA with noncompliance was required to provide new PST plans to demonstrate the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. Each LEA was required to submit a specific number of new plans based on the number of plans that were

identified as noncompliant. The percentage of new PST plans was determined by the number of individual cases of noncompliance within the LEA. For each 10% below 100% compliant, the LEA was required to upload one new PST plan into the UPIPS tool. For example, if a LEA was 80% compliant, the LEA was required to submit two new PST plans. The USBE reviewed the updated data and verified each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

LEA 1: 1 case; amended the postsecondary transition plan (PSTP) or held IEP meeting (mtg) and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 2: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 3: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 4: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 5: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 6: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 7: 16 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 8: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 9: 9 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 10: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 11: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 12: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 13: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 14: 2 cases; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 15: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 16: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 17: 7 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 18: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 19: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 20: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 21: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 22: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 23: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 24: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 25: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 26: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 27: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 28: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 29: 10 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 30: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 31: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 32: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 33: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 34: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 35: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 36: 11 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 37: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 38: 10 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 39: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 40: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 41: 3 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 42: 4 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 43: 7 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 44: 1 case; amended the PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 45: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 46: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 47: 9 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 48: 10 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 49: 9 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 50: 7 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 51: 2 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 52: 5 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 53: 6 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

LEA 54: 8 cases; amended each PSTP or held IEP mtg and wrote new PSTP; USBE reviewed updated data and verified correction consistent with QA 23-01.

Optional for FFY 2024 and 2025

Other Areas – All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
opt-out	opt-out	opt-out

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

18 – Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas)

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
112	9	112	9	0

18 – FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2023	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
121	121	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Description	Percent
Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.00%

18 – Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

None

18 – Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance)

Description	Number
1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2023 (the period from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024)	121
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	121
3. Number of findings not verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance)

Description	Number
4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	0
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – Indicator 4B	0
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – Indicator 9	0
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – Indicator 10	0

Description	Number
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – Indicator 11	0
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – Indicator 12	0
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – Indicator 13	0
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") – All other findings	0
7. Number of findings not yet verified as corrected	0

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 – Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

18 – Prior FFY Required Actions

None

18 – OSEP Response

None

18 – Required Actions

None

Utah 2025 Statewide Demographics Report of 2023–2024

Exiters with Disabilities

Comparison of Statewide Population and Statewide Respondents

Statewide Population (SP): N=4,951

Male SP: 62.76%

Female SP: 37.16%

Sex Unknown SP: < 1.00%

White SP: 66.09%

Asian SP: < 1.00%

African American/Black SP: 2.57%

Hispanic/Latino SP: 24.50%

American Indian/Alaskan Native SP: 1.90%

Pacific Islander SP: 1.23%

Multi-Racial SP: 2.91%

Intellectual Disability SP: 6.22%

Emotional-Behavioral Disability SP: 2.36%

Specific Learning Disability SP: 58.80%

Low Incidence Disability SP: 32.62%

Autism SP: 11.43%

Deaf/Blind SP: < 1.00%

Hearing Impairment/Deaf SP: < 1.00%

Multiple Disabilities SP: 1.43%

Other Health Impairment SP: 16.95%

Orthopedic Impairment SP: < 1.00%

Speech Language Impairment SP: 1.35%

Traumatic Brain Injury SP: <1.00%

Visual Impairment SP: < 1.00%

Regular Diploma SP: 76.07%

Alternate Diploma SP: 1.68%

Certificate of Completion SP: 3.53%

Maximum Age of Eligibility SP: 4.28%

Dropped Out SP: 14.44%

Statewide Respondents (SR): N=2,569

Male SR: 61.85%

Female SR: 38.15%

Sex Unknown SR: < 2.00%

White SR: 67.11%

Asian SR: < 2.00%

Black SR: 2.41%

Hispanic SR: 24.64%

American Indian/Alaskan Native SR: < 2.00%

Pacific Islander SR: < 2.00%

Multi-Racial SR: 2.57%

Intellectual Disability SR: 5.80%

Emotional Behavioral Disability SR: 1.99%

Specific Learning Disability SR: 56.54%

Low Incidence Disability SR: 35.77%

Autism SR: 13.55%

Deaf/Blind SR: < 2.00%

Hearing Impairment/Deaf SR: < 2.00%

Multiple Disabilities SR: < 2.00%

Other Health Impairment SR: 17.40%

Orthopedic Impairment SR: < 2.00%

Speech Language Impairment SR: < 2.00%

Traumatic Brain Injury SR: < 2.00%

Visual Impairment SR: < 2.00%

Regular Diploma SR: 77.89%

Alternate Diploma SR: < 2.00%

Certificate of Completion SR: 4.01%

Maximum Age of Eligibility SR: 4.71%

Dropped Out SR: 11.52%

Statewide Population Successfully Completed Interviews = 51.89%

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:

Deputy Superintendent (State Director of Special Education)

Email:

leah.voorhies@schools.utah.gov

Phone:

(801) 538-7898

Submitted on:

April 13, 2026

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Utah

2026 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
73.41%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	13	65.00%
Compliance	22	18	81.82%

(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 2026: Part B."

2026 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	94%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	86%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	28%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	31%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	89%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	93%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	84%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	52%	2

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
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%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	88%	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	18	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma*	67	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 34 C.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.”

2026 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 (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.	38.46%	YES	0
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.68%	YES	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	3.94%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	91.45%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.68%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	69.18%	YES	0
Indicator 18: General Supervision	100.00%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
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](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/FFY2024-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf) (https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/FFY2024-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf).

(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, 13 and 18.

Data Rubric

Utah

FFY 2024 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total	APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1	8	1	1
2	1	1	9	1	1
3A	1	1	10	1	1
3B	1	1	11	1	1
3C	1	1	12	1	1
3D	1	1	13	1	1
4A	1	1	14	1	1
4B	1	1	15	1	1
5	1	1	16	1	1
6	1	1	17	1	1
7	1	1	18	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Description	Total
Subtotal	22
Timely Submission Points – If the FFY 2024 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) =	27

(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: 7/30/25	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/7/26	1	1	1	3

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Description	Total
Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	27.00

(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 1.28571429 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

Description	Total
A. APR Grand Total	27
B. 618 Grand Total	27.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	54.00
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	54.00
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 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2026 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 associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described in the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/30/2025
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	2/18/2026
Part B Exiting	FS009	2/18/2026
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	2/18/2026
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/7/2026
Part B Dispute Resolution	FS227, FS228, FS229, FS230	11/19/2025
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	FS231, FS232, FS233, FS234, FS235, FS236, FS237, FS238	11/19/2025

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 and metadata responses submitted to *EDFacts* align. 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: 2024-25

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

Description	Number
(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	53
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	44
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	24
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	44
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	9

Section B: Mediation Requests

Description	Number
(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	25
(2.1) Mediations held.	17
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	7
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	3
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	10
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	5
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	8

Section C: Due Process Complaints

Description	Number
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	12
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	7
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	2
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	4
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	4
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	8

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

Description	Number
(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	1
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	1
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	1
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	1

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Utah

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/19/2025

How the Department Made Determinations

[How the Department Made Determinations](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/) (HTDMD; <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>) in 2026 will be posted on OSEP's IDEA website in June 2026.



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

Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2026

Honorable Molly Hart
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 Hart:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2026 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) 2024 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Utah's 2026 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2026 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 2026: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2026, as it did for Part B determinations in 2015-

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

2025. (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 2026, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment);
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2023-2024) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2026 determinations, OSEP is using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2026 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2025 determination. OSEP used the publicly available NAEP data for the BIE that was comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; specifically OSEP did not use NAEP participation data in making the BIE's 2026 determination because the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the BIE that is publicly available is 2020, whereas the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that is publicly available is 2024);
- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Utah's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (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 18, 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.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Utah's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2026 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 2024-2025," 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 2026 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2026 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State's 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 IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2023, 2024, and 2025), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2026 determination.

Utah's determination for 2025 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.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 website: [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\)](#), and requiring Utah to work with appropriate entities. 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 2025 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2027, 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 34 C.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.

The Department is committed to transparency, accountability, strong partnerships with States and stakeholders, high expectations, and improved outcomes for children with disabilities. To support these priorities, the Secretary is considering modifications to the factors the Department uses when making determinations, effective June 2027. Potential additional factors include graduation rates and assessment data, such as graduation rates for students with disabilities compared to all students, and Statewide assessment results of students with disabilities compared to all students. Other potential factors include longstanding noncompliance (such as OSEP-identified noncompliance that remains unresolved) as a factor in determinations.

For the FFY 2025 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2027, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2025 SPP/APR and the 2027 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and data submitted during correction opportunities will not be used for these

purposes. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, and 16 (as they have in the past). 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 EDPass prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the business rule; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the uploaded data 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 2024 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:

- (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,



Erin McHugh
Deputy Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Utah Director of Special Education/