

State of Utah

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004

Annual Performance Report

**FFY 2005
(2005-2006)**

**Prepared by the
Utah State Office of Education
February 1, 2007**

Table of Contents

Overview	3
Indicator 1 - Graduation Rates	8
Indicator 2 – Drop out Rates	12
Indicator 3 – Participation & Performance on Statewide Assessments	16
Indicator 4 – Suspension & Expulsion Rates	24
Indicator 5 – Least Restrictive Environment Placement (Ages 6-21)	30
Indicator 6– Least Restrictive Environment Placement (Preschool)	35
Indicator 7 – Preschool Outcomes	37
Indicator 8 – Parental Involvement	42
Indicator 9 – Disproportionality in Special Education	46
Indicator 10 - Disproportionality by Disability Category	49
Indicator 11 – Evaluation and Eligibility 60-Day Timeline	52
Indicator 12 – Transition from Part C to Part B	56
Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition	60
Indicator 14 – Post-Secondary Outcomes	63
Indicator 15 – General Supervision: Correction of Noncompliance	65
Indicator 16 – Formal Complaint 60-Day Timeline	69
Indicator 17 – Due Process Hearing 45-Day Timeline	72
Indicator 18 – Resolution Sessions	74
Indicator 19 – Mediations	76
Indicator 20 – Data & Reporting	78
APPENDIX A - Acronyms	80
APPENDIX B - Parent Involvement Survey	82
APPENDIX C - Post-Secondary Transition Survey	84
APPENDIX D - Table 7	89
APPENDIX E – Table 6	90

PART B ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

In accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416b(2)(C)(ii) and 34 CFR 300.602 the State of Utah must report annually to the Secretary on the performance of the State under the State Performance Plan (SPP). This report is called the Part B Annual Performance Report (Part B APR). The following report represents those requirements. For the February 1, 2007 submission States must provide SPP information for New Indicators 4B, 8, 9,10,11,13, and 18, and APR information for Indicators 1,2,3,4A,5,6,7,12,14,15,16,17,19,20. Utah's State Performance Plan, indicators and targets were developed with broad stakeholder input and publicly disseminated.

Overview of the Process

In order to implement the SPP and develop the APR, education specialists at the Utah State Office of Education were assigned specific indicators. The specialists' roles were to facilitate the implementation of the improvement activities and to collect and analyze the required data. The education specialists then facilitated any necessary revisions that would be calculated to maintain or improve results and meet or exceed the State's targets. An electronic tracking system was implemented to assist with documentation of the implementation of improvement activities and data collection. Progress on the implementation of those improvement activities was reported during USOE special education staff meetings. The State special education director and coordinators provided oversight to the process.

USOE Special Education Services staff members participated in the 2006 Accountability Conference September 18 and 19, 2006. Upon their return they shared the information obtained with other staff members involved in the SPP and APR processes. Staff members also participated in the OSEP teleconferences, and the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center Director teleconferences. Further consultation was provided through telephone calls with Utah's OSEP contact and through site visits made by Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center staff.

During the FFY 05 implementation of the SPP, and in preparation for the APR, The SPP requirements and indicators continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors (March 29, 2006 and November 2, 2006) and at monthly Charter School Roundtables. Changes and updates in OSEP requirements were articulated during these meetings. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP).

Data based revisions were made to SPP indicators, including new indicators, in coordination with the February 1, 2007 submission of the Part B Annual Performance Report. The revisions were made with broad stakeholder input, after implementation of improvement activities and careful analysis of progress and/or slippage on each indicator. The specific groups that were involved in the stakeholder input are noted in the "Stakeholder Input" section of the State Performance Plan Executive Summary.

The State will report to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP each year in February. The APR will be posted on the Utah State Office of Education's website and referenced in the *Utah Special Educator*, as well as the state superintendent's newsletter. The APR will be shared at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Utah Special Education Panel, the LEA Directors and the Charter School Roundtable after submission. Results will also be shared with the Utah Parent Center. The USOE will prepare a summary of indicators that are required to be publicly reported for each LEA. That report will be published each year on or before April 15. This process will coincide with the release of the Utah State Superintendent of Schools' Annual Data Report. The report will be posted on the USOE website and will be made available for posting on LEA websites. A report will be made on or before April 15 to USEAP, LEA special education directors, charter school directors, and other stakeholders as appropriate. The APR and LEA performance summary will both be reported to the Utah State Board of Education.

Activities to Meet Targets

In order to maintain a data-based focus, additional revisions and new or extended activities have been determined after careful analysis of results. These revisions have been added to the State Performance Plan in coordination with the February 1, 2007 submission of the Part B Annual Performance Report. The revisions were made with broad stakeholder input, after implementation of improvement activities and careful analysis of progress and/or slippage on each indicator.

Response to Required Actions

The Office of Special Education Programs conducted a site verification visit on April 27-28, 2004 in which a review of the state's system of General Supervision was conducted. In the findings letter received May 20, 2004, it was stated that the state must provide evidence of progress in correcting noncompliance, including current data and analysis on ensuring correction of all non compliance, including noncompliance it considers non-systemic, within one year of identification in the FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report. Further progress has been documented in this February 1, 2007 submission of Utah's Annual Performance Report.

As a result of OSEP's response letter to Utah's 2003 APR, the issue was identified that resolution of state formal complaints within the 60-day timeline was less than 100 percent. A process to correct that area of noncompliance was successfully implemented. FFY 50 data indicate that the level of compliance is now 100%.

OSEP's response to the December 2005 submission of the State Performance Plan indicated that the USOE did not report all required data for Indicator 12 and did not use all of the required measurements in reporting its baseline data for this indicator. Specifically, the State did not use 2004-2005 data for reporting on the number of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. Also, the State did not use 2004-2005 data in reporting on measurement b-those children referred and determined not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. The State did not specify the number of children whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. In response to this directive, the

USOE found that on page 62 of the SPP, data were mistakenly mislabeled. That error has been corrected; all required data are reported in the SPP and APR. The APR reflects completion of the required actions for Indicator 12.

In Utah's FFY 2002 APR letter, OSEP determined that too many students were not being tracked as they transitioned to Part B services. Indicator 13 indicates that Part B developed and implemented a method to track students referred from Part C to Part B. The 2005-2006 system indicates that Part B is now tracking 100% of students referred to Part B from Part C.

A letter from Troy Justesen, Acting Director of the Office of Special Education Programs, dated February 14, 2006 indicated that Utah's sampling plan was not technically sound. The letter further indicated that Utah would need to explain how the State addressed the deficiencies in data collection in the FFY 2005 APR. An attached template specified that all Utah LEAs with average daily memberships (ADM) of over 50,000 must be included in the sample each year. The required correction was made to Utah's sampling plan before sampling was conducted on indicators reported in this February 1, 2007 submission of Utah's APR. This FFY 05 Part B Annual Performance report reflects the necessary corrections in the sampling plan.

Utah's noncompliance reported under Indicator 3, Participation and Performance of Children with Disabilities in Statewide Assessments, has been the subject of Special Conditions placed on the State's FFY 2005 grant award. Subsequent to periodic reporting on progress made on the development, implementation and public reporting of results on Utah's Alternate Assessment (UAA) in the area of science, a letter received from Dr. Alexa Posny and dated November 28, 2006 announced that the Special Conditions have been removed from the FFY 2006 Part B grant award.

Sampling Methodology

Sampling will be utilized for Indicators 8 and 14. The methodology used is explained in the body of those indicators. The sampling plans for Indicators 8 and 14 have not been formally approved by OSEP. The sampling plan response letter indicated that a revised sampling methodology must be included in the FFY 2005 APR.

Utah's Special Education Monitoring Process

The Utah State Office of Education utilizes the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) as part of its general supervision process to assist LEAs in the process of improving outcomes for students with disabilities and to monitor compliance with state and federal requirements under IDEA. The following information describes the UPIPS process.

- The USOE, Special Education Services (USOE-SES) has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. USOE-SES's continuous improvement monitoring system, UPIPS, reflects the federal intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance and improvement of results for children with disabilities.

- The Local Educational Agency (LEA) has increased responsibility in this process. UPIPS consists of a three-phase process with LEAs entering a five-year rotation cycle. In year one, the LEA is charged with involving key stakeholders in the development of a self-assessment report that analyzes the LEA's effectiveness in two areas: ensuring compliance and improving results for students. A Program Improvement Plan for targeted areas is developed at the end of the self-assessment process. The USOE-SES works in partnership with the LEA, providing resources and technical assistance as necessary.
- An on-site validation visit takes place during year 2 of the cycle. Corrective Action Plans are developed for any compliance errors identified or validated during the visit. Evidence of completion of the corrective actions is submitted to the USOE, and results of the corrective actions are verified through additional student record reviews and review of off-site data, as needed.
- Annual reports on the LEA's progress on program improvement goals are submitted to the USOE during years 3, 4, and 5.
- Data on the UPIPS student record reviews are collected electronically, and both systemic and non-systemic compliance error reports are generated through the same system. This electronic data collection and management system has been developed under the GSEG grant from OSEP for the years 2000-2005. The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) has provided ongoing financial support for the development and maintenance of this system.
- Interview data from UPIPS on-site validation visits is aggregated electronically.
- The electronic management system for tracking the correction of compliance errors and annual reporting on LEA Program Improvement Goals has been developed.
- LEAs submit verification that all issues of noncompliance, systemic and non-systemic, are corrected as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year after identification.

USOE Data Collection and Storage Systems

USOE collects data from LEAs through a data clearinghouse, and the data are then stored in a data warehouse. LEAs submit various data to the clearinghouse throughout the year, including periodic uploads from their student information systems and statewide assessment results. The USOE collection and storage systems have several built-in mechanisms to ensure that data submitted are as accurate as possible. The following procedures explain these mechanisms:

- A data dictionary describes all data sets that are collected throughout the year and when such collections are made.
- Business rules ensure that all data collections have definitions, acceptable values, and missing data options. Most are sufficiently rigorous and do not allow for "free-form" input of data.
- Automatic data editing is employed by all online data entry systems. This requires that data pass through edit programs that produce lists of error reports.
- The clearinghouse and warehouse are based on a Secure Sybase Database management system which allows only limited direct access to selected IT staff with the USOE.

The majority of the data needed to develop state and federal special education reports is processed through these data systems. Beginning winter of 2006, all students were assigned a unique student identifier. This process will help to ensure a more accurate and secure process for assessment results.

Conclusion

Utah has made a concerted effort to include stakeholder input in all aspects of the SPP and APR processes. Rich discussions among members of the special education community as well as our general education and Title I partners have ensued. The State has developed and enhanced data systems to ensure accuracy of data. Budgetary processes and professional development activities have been aligned with the SPP. Utah has collected and carefully analyzed the data and utilized those data to make systemic changes designed to improve results for students with disabilities in the State. Utah remains committed to improving the results for children and youth with disabilities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: Measurement for Youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Regular education cohort graduation rate for 2005-2006 was calculated as follows: 28,338 graduates divided by 33,755 possible graduates = 83.95% cohort graduation rate for regular education students (Regular education cohort equals graduates + dropouts). Special education cohort graduation rate for 2005-2006 was calculated as follows: 2,301 graduates divided by 3,184 possible graduates + leavers = 72.27% cohort graduation rate for special education students (Special education cohort equals graduates + leavers).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities by 2% over previous year's graduation rate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target met.

Baseline data (2004-2005), calculated using an event rate, indicated a graduation rate for students with IEPs of 70.01%. Target was a 2% increase in the graduation rate of students with IEPs. Current data (2005-2006), using an event rate, demonstrate a 3.19% increase to 73.2%. USOE has adopted cohort rate calculation as the standard reporting format: current data (2005-06), using a cohort rate, demonstrate an increase in graduation rate of 2.26% to 72.27%.

In order to remain consistent with USOE reporting practices, graduation rates for all students, including students with IEPs, will be reported in future APRs using the Westat recommended formula; number of graduates ÷ (number of graduates + all leavers) = graduation rate

	2004-2005 (FFY 2004) Event rate	2005-2006 (FFY 2005) Cohort rate
All Students	85.58%	83.95%
Students with IEPs	70.01%	72.27%
Difference	-15.57%	-11.68%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Organize a USOE Graduation and Drop Out Task Force to review literature, analyze district data, identify factors that encourage students to stay in school and make recommendations on how to build local district capacity for improving graduation rate. This effort should align with Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) accountability efforts regarding graduation. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Task Force was organized which included the following stakeholders:
 - Special Education
 - At-Risk Youth
 - Youth in Custody (representing incarcerated youth and youth in foster care)
 - School Counseling Services
 - Minority students
 - Adult Education
 - Career and Technical Education
 - State Parent Teacher Association
 - Data Management
 - Utah Parent Center (State PTI organization)
 - Division of Work Force Services
 - United Way of Salt Lake
 - The Task Force met three times.
 - Representatives of this group reviewed literature and research related to increasing graduation rates and decreasing dropout rates.
 - Reviewed graduation requirements, graduation rates, drop out rates for state and LEAs.
 - Representatives of this group served on agency committees and task forces to discuss school accountability policies and changes to state graduation requirements.
 - Recommended implementation of the Hart Research Associates survey, developed for the Gates Foundation, as a final project for 16 students in a USU school counseling graduate program.
 - Reviewed results of survey; compared results with national survey results.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- An improved data collection for the exit data was used in the 2005-2006 school year. This new collection has improved exit data accuracy and validity for the 2005-2006 school year; it is anticipated that this improvement will continue in the future.
- There has been an increased state-wide public focus on graduation from high school with a diploma due to changes in graduation requirements that require UBSCT participation. Additionally the proposed Utah Performance Assessment for Students (U-PASS) will assess high school's performance, in part, by its graduation rate.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Recommend to USOE that annual implementation of the Gates Foundation survey be part of the partnership with the University of Utah Education Policy Center.	Fall 2006	Hart Research Associates survey; University of Utah Education Policy Center; Graduation Drop Out Task Force	National data from this survey has provided insight into reasons that students do not remain in school. The Task Force feels that this information, disaggregated by ethnicity and disability, would provide solid data regarding Utah students.
2. Prepare report for Utah State School Board outlining findings from Gates Foundation survey, state graduation/drop out rates over time, and recommendations.	Spring 2007	Graduation and Drop Out Task Force members; State School Board.	The Task Force determined that it did not have the authority to recommend that LEAs implement new practices without Board support and Board-authorized resources.
3. Gather graduation/drop out data for SWD from LEAs; rank LEAs based on graduation rates; select top 10 LEAs based on high graduation, low drop out rates.	Fall 2006	SEA staff; 618 exit reports; USOE data	Review of Indicators 1 & 2 activities indicated that, while activities were designed to lead to systemic changes in graduation and drop out rates, these activities did lead to identification of factors specific to SWD. New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
4. Invite LEAs to self-assess, using 10 Effective Strategies developed by National Dropout Prevention Center.	Winter 2006	LEA Special Education Directors; SEA staff; National Dropout Prevention Center publications	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
5. Meet with selected LEAs to analyze self-assessment, determine specific strategies implemented in successful LEAs	Winter 2006	LEA Special Education Directors; SEA staff; National Dropout Prevention Center publications	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.

6. Share successful strategies with all LEAs at Spring Administrative Meetings	Spring 2007	LEA Special Education Directors; SEA staff; National Dropout Prevention Center publications	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
7. Develop training targets, based on strategies previously identified; present to Consortium, Board and State Advisory Panel for input and direction for implementation	Summer 2007	SEA staff; Consortium Board, Utah State Advisory Panel, and Special Education Professional Development Improvement Grant	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
8. Implement training; monitor graduation and drop out rates	Ongoing	SEA staff; UPDC staff; 618 exit reports; USOE data	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: Measurement for Youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Regular education event dropout rate for 2005-2006 was calculated as follows: 5222 dropouts divided by 146,132 enrolled ages 14 and above = 3.57 % event drop out rate for regular education students. Special education event drop out rate for 2005-2006 was calculated as follows: 830 dropouts as per the 2005-2006 Exit report divided by 17,029 Students ages 14-21 as per the December 1 2005 Child Count = 4.90% event dropout rate for students with disabilities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Reduce the percentage of students with IEPs dropping out of school by 2% of previous year's percentage.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target not met.

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated a dropout rate of 3.56% for students with IEPs. Target was a 2% decrease in the baseline percentage. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 1.34% increase to 4.9%.

Drop Out Rates		
	2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	2005-2006 (FFY 2005)
All Students	3.15%	3.57%
Students with IEPs	3.56%	4.9%
Difference	+0.41%	-1.33%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Organize a USOE Graduation and Drop Out Task Force to review literature, analyze district data, identify factors that encourage students to stay in school and make recommendations on how to build local district capacity for improving graduation rate. This effort should align with Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) accountability efforts regarding graduation. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Task Force was organized which included the following stakeholders:
 - Special Education
 - At-Risk Youth
 - Youth in Custody (representing incarcerated youth and youth in foster care)
 - School Counseling Services
 - Minority students
 - Adult Education
 - Career and Technical Education
 - State Parent Teacher Association
 - Data Management
 - Utah Parent Center (State PTI organization)
 - Division of Work Force Services
 - United Way of Salt Lake
 - The Task Force met three times
 - Representatives of this group reviewed literature and research related to increasing graduation rates and decreasing dropout rates.
 - Reviewed graduation requirements, graduation rates, drop out rates for state and LEAs.
 - Representatives of this group served on agency committees and task forces to discuss school accountability policies and changes to state graduation requirements.
 - Recommended implementation of the Hart Research Associates survey, developed for the Gates Foundation, as a final project for 16 students in a USU school counseling graduate program.
 - Reviewed results of survey; compared results with national survey results.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- In 2004-2005, USOE Data Clearinghouse staff clarified exit code definitions, consolidating vague codes, such as “exited not known to be continuing”, into one code, “dropout”. In addition USOE staff distributed changes to all LEAs and special education staff conducted 6 regional trainings with LEA special education personnel to clarify 618 data reporting requirements.

Slippage:

- An improved data collection for the exit data was used for the first time in 2005-2006 school year. This new collection has been designed to improve exit data accuracy and validity for not only the 2005-2006 school year, but for many years to come. Data also reflect the final wave of “moved not known to be continuing” students being moved to the Drop Out category. Trend data indicate a larger than usual increase in drop outs in 2005-2006 in Special Education. An informal phone survey was conducted with LEAs that had significant increases in drop out numbers to determine whether LEA special education administrators were aware of changes within the LEA that might affect the number of students dropping out of school. These increases appear to be due to two reasons:

- Areas in Utah are experiencing rapid economic growth due to the burgeoning natural gas industry. This has resulted in students and school staff leaving for employment in the field, often at very high starting wages.
- LEAs are implementing the revised data collection system that eliminates the category “moved not known to be continuing” for students who exit the school, but for whom records are not requested by another LEA. These students must now be reported as “drop out”.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

FFY	Targets	Justification
2007 (2007-2008)	Reduce the percentage of students with IEPs dropping out of school by 2% of previous year's percentage.	Previous targets were considered too rigorous and unreachable, given trend data indicating the largest decrease (FFY 2003 to FY 2004) was 0.14%.
2008 (20087-20097)	Reduce the percentage of students with IEPs dropping out of school by 2% of previous year's percentage.	
2009 (2009-2010)	Reduce the percentage of students with IEPs dropping out of school by 2% of previous year's percentage.	
2010 (2010-2011)	Reduce the percentage of students with IEPs who drop out by 2% compared to the previous year's percentage, for an overall reduction of 10% in the 2004-05 baseline percentage of students with IEPs dropping out.	

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Recommend to USOE that annual implementation of the Gates Foundation survey be part of the partnership with the University of Utah Education Policy Center.	Fall 2006	Hart Research Associates survey; University of Utah Education Policy Center; Graduation Drop Out Task Force	Justification: National data from this has provided insight into reasons that students do not remain in school. The Task Force feels that this information, disaggregated by ethnicity and disability, would provide solid data regarding Utah students.
2. Prepare report for Utah State School Board outlining findings from Gates Foundation survey, state graduation/drop out rates over time, and recommendations.	Spring 2007	Graduation and Drop Out Task Force members; State School Board.	The Task Force determined that it did not have the authority to recommend that LEAs implement new practices without Board support and Board-authorized resources.
3. Gather graduation/drop out data for SWD from LEAs; rank LEAs based on	Fall 2006	SEA staff; 618 exit reports; USOE data	Review of Indicators 1 & 2 activities indicated that, while activities were designed to lead to systemic changes in graduation and drop out rates, these activities did lead to identification of

graduation rates; select top 10 LEAs based on high graduation, low drop out rates.			factors specific to SWD. New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
4. Invite LEAs to self-assess, using 10 Effective Strategies developed by National Dropout Prevention Center.	Winter 2006	LEA Special Education Directors; SEA staff; National Dropout Prevention Center publications	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
5. Meet with selected LEAs to analyze self-assessment, determine specific strategies implemented in successful LEAs	Winter 2006	LEA Special Education Directors; SEA staff; National Dropout Prevention Center publications	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
6. Share successful strategies with all LEAs at Spring Administrative Meetings	Spring 2007	LEA Special Education Directors; SEA staff; National Dropout Prevention Center publications	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
7. Develop training targets, based on strategies previously identified; present to Consortium Board and State Advisory Panel for input and direction for implementation	Summer 2007	SEA staff; Consortium Board; Utah State Advisory Panel	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.
8. Implement training; monitor graduation and drop out rates	Ongoing	SEA staff; UPDC staff; 618 exit reports; USOE data	New activities (numbers 3 – 8) are designed to be implemented parallel to the activities of the Task Force.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.

C Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \text{ divided by the (total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State)}] \text{ times } 100.$

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \text{ divided by } (a)].$

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \text{ divided by } (a)].$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>A. The percent of LEAs that made AYP in the students with disabilities subgroup will increase to 48% by 2005-2006.</p> <p>B. The percent of students with disabilities participating in statewide assessments in math will increase to 95% by 2005-06. The percent of students with disabilities participating in statewide assessments in language arts will increase to 95% in 2005-06.</p> <p>C. The percent of students with disabilities who are proficient in language arts assessments will increase to 43% by 2005-06. The percent of students with disabilities who are proficient in math assessments will increase to 42% by 2005-06.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

A. Target met for Language Arts and Math

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 44% of districts that met the “n” size met the State’s AYP objectives for both Language Arts and Math. The Target was a 4% increase to 48%. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 29% increase/decrease to 73%.

2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	2005-2006 (FFY 2005)	Target Met
<p>25/57</p> <p>44%</p>	<p>44/60</p> <p>73%</p>	<p>Yes</p>

B. Target met for Math

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 86% of districts met the participation rates for math. The target was a 9% increase. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 12% increase to 98%.

Target met for Language Arts

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 92% of districts that met the “n” size met the State’s AYP objectives for math. The target was a 3% increase. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 7.6% increase to 99.6%.

Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities							
	a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades	b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations)	c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards	e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.	Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].
Math	32,423	15,596 48.10%	14,044 42.32%	0 0.00%	2,245 6.92%	538 1.66%	98.34%
Language Arts	33,135	16,207 48.91%	14,515 43.81%	0 0.00%	2,283 6.89%	130 0.39%	99.61%

C. Target met for Math

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 36.64% of districts met proficiency rates for math. The target was a 5.36% increase to 42%. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 7.25% increase to 44%.

Target not met for Language Arts

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 37.60% of districts met proficiency rates for language arts. The target was a 5.40% increase to 43%. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 4.87% increase to 42.47%, which is 0.53% lower than the target.

Proficiency Rates Students with Disabilities							
	a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades	b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations	c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations)	d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards	e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards	Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.	Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].
Math	31,976	7,974 24.94%	4,255 13.31%	0 0.00%	1,806 5.65%	17,941 56.11%	43.89%
Language Arts	33,135	8,274 24.97%	3,847 11.61%	0 0.00%	1,952 5.89%	19,062 57.53%	42.47%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Sponsor professional development on scientifically based researched interventions and tiered literacy instruction, reading and math. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Developed a statewide literacy framework with targeted interventions and assessments and provided professional development.
 - Comprehensive professional development was provided. The 3,543 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, and others.
 - Two co-sponsored conferences were held.
 - Utah Branch of the International Dyslexia Association (UBIDA) - 350 participants including parents, general educators, and special educators.
 - Learning Disabilities Association of Utah (LDAU) – 300 participants including parents, general educators and special educators.
 - Access to the General Curriculum professional development was provided. The 4,324 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, students, and others.
 - Social and Behavior Competencies professional development was provided. The 2,738 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, students, and others.
 - Coordination of General and Special Education professional development was provided. The 2,709 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, students, and others.
 - Core Academy (math and science) included 3,600 participants. General educators, special educators and administrators attended.
2. Update U-PASS Accommodations Manual. Completed.
 - Representatives from general education, special education, assessment directors, special education directors, parents, educational equity, English language learners, and CMAC attended five meetings and provided input for development of U-PASS Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy.
 - A draft of U-PASS Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy was presented to Special Education Directors and the Assessment Directors on May 11, 2006.
3. Participate with general education curriculum staff to develop a statewide framework for Literacy Instruction. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Representatives from special education, general education, and Title I created a draft framework called Utah's 3 Tier Model of Reading Instruction K-12. A total of seven meetings were held.
 - Stakeholders, who included special education directors, Title I administrators, Rural Schools Conference attendees, district literacy specialists, USOE staff, and Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), provided input for draft development. A total of six meetings were held.

4. Collaborate with general education to provide statewide professional development on literacy instruction. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Comprehensive professional development was provided. The 3,543 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, and others.
 - Two co-sponsored conferences were held.
 - Utah Branch of the International Dyslexia Association (UBIDA) - 350 participants including parents, general educators, and special educators.
 - Learning Disabilities Association of Utah (LDAU) – 300 participants including parents, general educators and special educators.
 - Access to the General Curriculum professional development was provided. The 4,324 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, students, and others.
 - Social and Behavior Competencies professional development was provided. The 2,738 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, students, and others.
 - Coordination of General and Special Education professional development was provided. The 2,709 participants included general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, related service providers, parents, students, and others.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- **A.** Progress was made in language arts and math due to continuing educator professional development in literacy and numeracy as was discussed previously in the completed activities.
- **B.** Progress was made in participation for both language arts and math due to beginning the use of an individual SSID (unique identifier) number for each student.
- **C.** Progress was made in math proficiency due to continuing educator professional development in numeracy.

Slippage:

- **C.** Slippage in Language Arts proficiency occurred due to data anomalies based on validating student level data. A solution is being implemented for 2007-2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activities	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Provide statewide professional development on literacy (reading) instruction and interventions for general and special educators	Summer 2006 and ongoing	USOE & UPDC Staff, contracted presenters, IDEA discretionary funds	The activity wording was changed for clarity and measurability. The prior activity combined reading and math and they are now separated. The timeline was changed.
2. Research best practices for numeracy instruction and interventions and create professional development activities for general and special educators	Spring 2006 and ongoing	USOE & UPDC Staff	This activity was added to separate reading and math.
3. Publish U-PASS Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy and revise yearly to reflect new accommodation research. It will be posted on the USOE website.	Summer 2006 and ongoing	USOE Special Education Staff & USOE Assessment Staff, IDEA discretionary funds	The activity wording was changed for clarity and measurability. The activity now includes ongoing changes in the policy. The timeline was changed.
4. Develop training materials on U-PASS Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy and post on USOE website.	Summer and Fall 2006	USOE Special Education Staff	The activity wording was changed for clarity and measurability. The activity now includes how policy and training materials can be accessed. The timeline was changed.
5. Train at LEA request on U-PASS Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy	September 2006 and ongoing	USOE Special Education Staff, USOE Assessment Staff, IDEA discretionary funds	The activity wording was changed for clarity and measurability. The training will now be done at LEA request.
6. Research an alternate assessment based on 2% flexibility under NCLB	2007 and ongoing	USOE Special Education Staff, USOE Assessment Staff, contracted personnel, IDEA discretionary	The activity was changed to research an alternate 2% assessment rather than create one. The timeline has also been changed due to lack of regulations.

		funds, state and federal assessment funds	
7. Develop a statewide procedure for districts to ensure the state does not go over 1% on alternate assessments measured against alternate achievement standards.	2007 and ongoing	USOE Special Education Staff	This activity was added to as a preventive strategy.
8. Collaborate and publish Utah's 3 Tier Model of Reading Instruction K-12	2006-2007	USOE & UPDC Staff, IDEA discretionary funds	This activity wording was changed to provide clarity, since the document has been named Utah's 3 Tier Model of Reading Instruction K-12.
9. Collaborate with general education to provide statewide professional development on literacy instruction	2004 and ongoing	USOE & UPDC Staff, IDEA discretionary funds	This activity has been eliminated because it is now incorporated into other activities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-06)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Reduce number of districts with significant discrepancies 1%. B. To be determined after baseline data is collected.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

A. Target met.

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 7.3% of districts had significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities. The target was a 1% decrease. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a decrease of 4.3% to 3% of districts having significant discrepancies.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Enhance and expand Utah's Behavior Initiatives (UBI) in Utah. Continue to emphasize UBI trainings through adequate funding and training opportunities for districts and charter schools. Completed (and ongoing).
 - UBI expanded in fall of 2005 to include 5 district pilots and 5 prospective district pilots.
 - UBI expanded in fall of 2006 to include 10 District pilots and 3 prospective district pilots. Non-pilot districts received training opportunities under the UBI Project.
 - In 2005-2006 UBI conducted a Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) training platform for 65 schools within the 10 district pilots. Ten trainings at both state and district levels were held between August 2005 and June 2006 in which 1,705 participated.

2. Build local capacity through partnership with the Utah State Improvement Grant for UBI District Positive Behavioral support Pilots. Expand the capacity of LEAs to support social and academic behavioral outcomes for students. Establish system to achieve better learning outcomes while preventing problem behaviors from occurring. Completed (and ongoing).
 - The UBI Advisory Council gives technical assistance to allow large-scale implementation of both district-wide and school-wide PBS. Four advisory council meetings were held between December 2005 and September 2006 in which 55 participated.
 - Five UBI District Coaches were identified in pilot districts for 2005-2006 school year, and five additional for 2006-2007 school year to develop a higher level of in district technical support for schools implementing positive behavior supports and maintain fidelity of implementation commensurate with state guidelines. In addition to on-site training and technical assistance, UBI district coaches participated in a coaching network, which included monthly meetings, electronic correspondence and listserv participation and conference attendance. Finally, 3 prospective districts identified coaches to participate in mentoring and training for future district initiatives with UBI. Thirteen Coaching Network meetings were held between August 2005 and June 2006 in which 16 participated.
 - Ten UBI District Leadership Teams were developed to actively coordinate implementation efforts within their districts. The objective of the teams is to increase capacity in four primary areas: training capacity, coaching capacity, evaluation capacity, and coordination capacity. The UBI Leadership Teams met four times a year to establish a system that enables effective and efficient utilization of materials, time, personnel, etc. in the implementation of a 3-5 year action plan. Twelve UBI meetings were held in 05-06 in which 114 participated.
 - Regional Behavior Trainings were held in the Southern and Eastern parts of the state to increase special education personnel's skills and abilities to provide those positive behavioral supports necessary to reduce problem behaviors within school climates. Two trainings were held in January and February 2006 in which 250 participated.

3. Develop a self assessment for districts to assess the continuum of behavioral supports for students struggling with emotional/behavioral difficulties. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Schools involved with the UBI project are required to conduct a School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) two times a year (Fall & Spring). The School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) is designed to assess and evaluate the critical features of school-wide effective behavior support across each academic school year.

4. Review and revise Statewide Assistance Team (SWAT) process for students with the most severe behavior difficulties to ensure enhancing local capacity of LEAs to effectively enable these students to succeed in school. Completed.
 - SWAT process was re-designed to focus on the needs of individuals who exhibited patterns of problem behavior. Revisions involved a process of functional behavioral assessment (FBA) and a support plan comprised of individualized, assessment-based intervention strategies including a wide range of options such as: (1) guidance or instruction for the student to use new skills as a replacement for problem behaviors, (2) some rearrangement of the antecedent environment so that problems can be prevented and desirable behaviors can be encouraged, and (3) procedures for monitoring, evaluating, and reassessing of the plan as necessary. As part of this revision the trend of requests was analyzed to determine specific behavioral training needs within the state.
5. Collaborate with USOE Curriculum Department to improve and expand use of Life Skills Curriculum. Completed (with revisions).
 - The collaboration with the USOE Curriculum Department needed to be restructured to work with the USOE Student Services and Comprehensive Guidance Section. The tasks completed under these revisions helped support the Utah State Board of Education with refining board rules to include a greater emphasis on School District Policies with regard to Bullying and Relational Aggression. This was done through a survey that was conducted state-wide to gain a better understanding of the current issues facing school administrators with regard to bullying/relational aggression. The results of this survey were used in a final report to the Utah State Board of Education resulting in the adoption of a new Board Rule requiring that districts address bullying and relational aggression.
 - Training on Relational Aggression was held in November 2005 in which 70 participated.
 - The USOE, through the UBI Project and its state and community coalition partners was awarded the Integrate Schools and Mental Health Systems Grant through the U.S. Department of Education.
6. Refine RISEP data collection system to include IDEA-required data elements. Completed.
 - A meeting was held with USOE Safe and Drug Free Coordinator and RISEP system staff to discuss IDEA-required data elements being added to the current RISEP system. At this point the only element that could be added to the current system would be IDEA student status.
 - A meeting was held with USOE Data Warehouse staff to discuss EDEN and the potential impact on APR indicators.
7. Utilize RISEP data to determine rates of suspension and expulsion. Completed.
 - A report was obtained from USOE Safe and Drug Free Coordinator and "determined insufficient," lacking adequate data that can be applied to IDEA required data elements.
8. Evaluate the results of activities from 2005-07 and determine additional activities based on those data. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Collaborated with the Utah State Office of Education, Utah Professional Development Center, and Utah State Improvement Grant. An evaluation of the UBI project has been done by a private evaluator EndVision.

Explanation of progress or slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- The target was met with 3% of LEAs identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities for more than ten days. In 2004-2005, 7.3% of LEAs were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities for more than ten days.
- The activities discussed in the “Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed” section greatly contributed to the progress, particularly the Utah Behavior Initiatives (UBI).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activities	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Collaborate with USOE Data Warehouse to improve data collection. Assist with Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) system coming online at USOE.	2006-2007	USOE Special Education Staff, USOE Data Warehouse Staff	This will improve the valid, reliable and timely data that are submitted by LEAs.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4B- Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.
--

Measurement:

B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Utah 618 Table 5 data on short and long-term suspension and expulsion is collected annually from LEAs as required by OSEP. LEAs have a variety of internal systems for collecting and tracking data on suspensions and expulsions. Each LEA aggregates the data and submits it in written form to the SEA. Utah has determined its definition of "significant discrepancy" based on a significant difference from the state wide mean rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities across all LEAs. The rate of suspensions of more than 120 days for each LEA was calculated. The mean rate and the standard deviation were computed. Significant discrepancy was defined as two or more standard deviations from the mean.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Baseline analysis of the data indicates that 3% of LEAs with significant discrepancy in rate of suspensions and expulsions of student with disability by race and ethnicity.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data show that 3% of LEAs have rates of suspension/expulsion for more than 10 days that show a significant discrepancy from the mean rate for all LEAs in the state. Efforts to improve the accuracy of data collection on suspension and expulsion for with disabilities will be ongoing.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline data: 3% of LEAs with significant discrepancy of rates in suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities by race and ethnicity.
2006 (2006-2007)	Maintain or reduce the % of LEAs with significant discrepancy in rate of suspensions and expulsions of student with disability by race and ethnicity.
2007 (2007-2008)	Maintain or reduce the % of LEAs with significant discrepancy in rate of suspensions and expulsions of student with disability by race and ethnicity.
2008 (2008-2009)	Maintain or reduce the % of LEAs with significant discrepancy in rate of suspensions and expulsions of student with disability by race and ethnicity.
2009 (2009-2010)	Maintain or reduce the % of LEAs with significant discrepancy in rate of suspensions and expulsions of student with disability by race and ethnicity.
2010 (2010-2011)	Maintain or reduce the % of LEAs with significant discrepancy in rate of suspensions and expulsions of student with disability by race and ethnicity.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. Enhance and expand Utah's Behavior Initiatives (UBI) in Utah. Continue to emphasize UBI training through adequate funding and training opportunities for districts and charter schools.	2006-2011	IDEA Discretionary Funds, State Improvement Grant Funds, USOE Behavior Specialist, UPDC Staff.
2. Build local capacity through partnership with Utah State Improvement Grant for UBI District Positive Behavioral Support Pilots. Expand the capacity of LEAs to support social and academic outcomes for students. Establish system to achieve better learning outcomes while preventing problem behaviors from occurring.	2006-2011	IDEA Discretionary Funds, State Improvement Grant Funds, USOE Behavior Specialist, UPDC Staff.
3. Review and revise Statewide Assistance Team (SWAT) process for students with the most severe behavior difficulties to ensure enhancing local capacity of LEAs to effectively enable these students to succeed in school.	2006-2011	USOE Staff, UPDC Staff, Contracted Behavior Consultants
4. Collaborate with USOE Data Warehouse to determine more useful process for data collection on suspension and expulsion of students with in state. Assist in EDEN system coming online at USOE.	2006-2011	USOE special education staff & USOE Data Warehouse staff
5. Evaluate the results of activities from 2006-2007 and determine additional activities based on data.	Fall 2007-2011	IDEA Discretionary Funds, State Improvement Grant Funds, USOE Behavior Specialist, UPDC Staff.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>A. The percentage of students with disabilities removed from regular class less than 21% of the day will increase by 3% over previous school year.</p> <p>B. The percentage of students with disabilities removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day will decrease by 3% over previous school year.</p> <p>C. The percentage of students with disabilities served in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements will decrease by 0.1% over previous school year.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

A. Target met

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated that 42.10% of students were removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day. The target was a 3% increase over the previous school year. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 15.63% increase to 48.68%.

B. Target met

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated that 21.50% of students were removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day. The target was a 3% decrease over the previous school year. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 31.53% decrease to 14.72%.

C. Target not met

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated that 3.47% of students were served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound hospital placements. The target was a 0.1% decrease over the previous school year. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate an increase to 3.56%.

Setting	2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	2005-06 (FFY 2005)	Met target
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	42.1% N=22,174/52,619	48.68% N=25,830/53,064	Y
B. Removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day	21.5% N=11,289/52,619	14.72% N=7809/53,064	Y
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital places	3.47%* N=1826/52,619	3.56% N=1893/53,064	N

* The data submitted in last years SPP were incorrect for setting C. They have been corrected in the SPP, and the data in this APR are the correct numbers.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Further align Utah LRE definitions with Federal definitions. Completed.
 - Utah LRE definitions were aligned with Federal definition.
 - Representatives from districts, USOE, parent groups and special education directors formed a taskforce to align definitions.
 - Data recording and data collection was improved.
 - Four meetings were held.
2. Provide LEAs with LRE data collection form and training to LEAs at State Data Conference. Completed.
 - Seven trainings were provided to LEAs on the LRE data collection form with 100% participation rate.
3. Provide regional trainings to LEAs' data input personnel. Completed.
 - Seven regional trainings were provided to LEAs on data input personnel with 100% participation.

4. Work with data clearinghouse manager to design electronic data collection mechanism that integrates LRE data into warehouse for 2006-07 school year. Completed.
 - In cooperation with the data warehouse, a collection form was developed and trainings were scheduled.
 - The electronic management collection system was improved for collecting student information.
 - Students located at a special school for students with sensory impairments were added to the State Student Information System (SIS).
5. Provide technical assistance to LEAs on data collection. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Ongoing technical assistance is provided via LEA visits or teleconferences.
6. Collaborate to provide state wide conferences for all educators regarding classroom management, instruction, school wide and targeted interventions to support students in LRE. Completed (and ongoing).
 - State wide training, in collaboration with general education, was provided in the following areas:
 - Response to intervention (RtI)
 - DIBELS, progress monitoring, screening
 - Assessments, informal and formal
 - Interventions for struggling readers
 - Behavior strategies
 - Tier instruction
 - ELL instruction
 - Math and science instructional strategies
 - Participants included general and special educators, administrators, parents, Title I schools, secondary and elementary educators, totaling 15,564.
7. Collaborate on program development of tiered instruction for all educators to support students in LRE. Completed (and ongoing).
 - A tier instruction framework was developed to support students in LRE.
 - Special educators and general educators reviewed and recommended instructional/intervention materials for classroom teachers.
 - USOE and UPDC staff participated with CORE Academy leaders to develop instructional goals for math and science.
 - Instruction/intervention materials were listed on the USOE website and in the 3 Tier reading document.
 - Ten meetings with 40 general and special educators were held.
8. Participate with general curriculum staff to develop a state wide framework for literacy instruction including targeted interventions and assessment to ensure LRE for students. Completed (and ongoing).
 - A state wide literacy instructional framework with targeted interventions and assessments was developed.
 - Representatives from general education, Title I and special education created a draft framework called Utah's 3 Tier Model of Reading Instruction K-12.

- Stakeholder input was incorporated into the draft. The stakeholders included: Special Education Directors, Title I Administrators, Rural Schools Conference attendees, USOE Staff, USEAP, District Literacy Specialists.
 - The draft document was completed after thirteen meetings with 60 stakeholders.
9. Provide IDEA discretionary funds to LEAs to enhance services for students in LRE. Completed (and ongoing).
- LEAs were provided with funding to improve literacy instruction.
 - Model school sites were identified and each site was awarded funding to collaborate and provide models for literacy instruction for all students.
 - LEAs were awarded funding to create and maintain collaboration with general education in literacy instruction for all students.
 - 4 model sites were awarded
 - \$10,000 each
 - 2 junior highs
 - 2 elementaries
 - 17 LEAs were awarded an average of \$4000 each.
10. Collaborate in the publication of a technical assistance document for all educators which describes the statewide framework for literacy instruction. Completed (and ongoing).
- The draft technical assistance document was presented to stakeholders.
 - Stakeholders included Special Education directors, Title I Administrators, Rural Schools Conference participants, Principals, District Literacy Specialists, and Utah Parent Center.
 - The document will remain a draft pending School Board approval.
 - An electronic draft is posted on UPDC, USOE & MPRRC websites for public access.
 - 2000 draft copies were printed and distributed.
11. Collaborate with Comprehensive Guidance to train educators in behavior management strategies and targeted interventions to ensure LRE for students with disabilities. Completed (and ongoing).
- Collaborated with Comprehensive Guidance to train educators in behavior management strategies and targeted interventions.
 - Behavior coaches trained general and special educators in Utah's Behavior Initiative (UBI), incorporating Positive Schoolwide Behavior strategies.
 - 66 schools participated.
12. Provide to LEAs a summary of LRE data to be used in self-assessment and verification portions of the UPIPS monitoring process. Completed (and ongoing).
- LEAs were provided with a summary of LRE data for self-assessment and verification portions of the UPIPS monitoring system.
 - LEAs received a summary of their annual data.
 - Data were compared to the state data.
 - LEAs used the data during their self-assessment process.
 - Utah reviewed LRE data annually.

Explanation of progress or slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- The progress that occurred in A and B is highly attributed to the collaboration between general and special education. The continuous informal and formal interaction and professional development activities have enhanced the working relationships of general and special educators and have aligned goals for success of all students.

Slippage:

- The slippage in the C target data was based on data and accountability factors. Increased clarification of environment codes resulted in more accurate reporting. The USOE will monitor to verify that the indicated slippage was indeed the result of correcting a data problem and will continue to monitor the data to determine additional activities that will result in meeting targets.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. An ad hoc committee of USOE, staff of special school for students with sensory impairments and district representatives will be formed to clarify roles, responsibilities and provide direction for professional development for staff at service unit.	September 2005 and ongoing	USOE Staff, Special School Staff	UPIPS monitoring indicated a need for clarifications.
2. Additional technical assistance will be provided to the special school for students with sensory impairments.	September 2005 and going	USOE Staff, Special School Staff	UPIPS monitoring indicated a need for additional technical assistance.
3. Monitor to verify that the indicated slippage was indeed the result of correcting a data problem.	2006-2007 and ongoing	Data manager	To ensure accurate reporting on LRE environments.
4. Continue to monitor the data to determine additional activities that will result in meeting targets.	2006-2007 and ongoing	Data manager and USOE staff	To ensure that targets are met.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e. early childhood settings home and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Increase the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers to 56%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target met.

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 55.5% of preschool children with IEPs received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers. The target was to increase to 56%. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 3.9% increase to 59.4%.

**CHART A
Early Childhood Environments**

	Typical Early Childhood Setting	Part-time/Part Time	Reverse Mainstreaming	Total Number of Preschool Students
2004-2005 (FFY 2004)	41.09% n=2967	1.38% n=100	13.05% n=942	n=7221
2005-2006 (FFY 2005)	45.75% n=3414	1.37% n=102	12.28% n=916	n=7462

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Complete Utah’s Preschool LRE Technical Assistance Manual to provide guidance on preschool environments and inclusive settings. Completed.
 - Partners across the State of Utah participated in meetings to develop this document. This document supports early childhood programs and extends the opportunities for inclusion in preschool special education.
2. Present the LRE Manual to the LEA directors for input into a professional development component based on the LRE Manual. Completed.
 - The manual is posted on the Utah State Office of Education and NECTAC websites.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- The reason for the gain in settings that include typically developing peers is due to the increased emphasis within the preschools on LRE.
- NECTAC and MPRRC assisted the state by facilitating a workgroup to develop LRE manual.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activities	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. New activities will be developed after the new codes provide baseline information.	February 2007	619 Coordinator	FFY 2006 year baseline data will be collected for the new preschool environment codes, which will change the data as measured in previous APR.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

<p>Indicator 7- Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>

Measurement:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
 - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

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

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Indicator 7: Response to required action. OSEP letter dated March 15, 2006.

The review of sampling plans articulated in a letter dated February 14, 2006 indicates that Utah's sampling plan needed to be corrected to include all LEAs with $n \geq 50,000$ included in sample each year. Utah has revised its sampling plans to include all LEAs with $n \geq 50,000$ students each year. However, for this indicator sampling will not be used.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

For the 2004-2005 school year Utah State Office of Education contracted with Early Intervention Research Institute (EIRI) to design a method for assessing outcomes for preschoolers. EIRI was to expand their project for the 2005-2006 school year to include a larger sample size as well as to assess the students as they exit preschool programs. EIRI was unable to complete the project. Therefore, a new method of collection was developed and implemented.

With stakeholder input, a collection system was developed that would only support 3 OSEP categories. In July 2005, using sampling, districts throughout Utah collected and reported baseline data to the Utah State Office of Education from the 2005-2006 school year using the yes/no option.

In October 2006 a stakeholder group met to change the data collection system to meet the new requirements. Since stakeholders wanted to use multiple evaluation measures, it was decided to use the Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) which is the tool developed by the Early Childhood Outcome Center (ECO), using definitions, guidelines, training materials, and other resources developed by ECO. Working with the ECO Center, some minor non-substantive modifications were made to the COSF retaining the ECO process in tact. With ECO's permission Utah's form and process was changed to Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (U-POD). Since the system for collecting preschool outcomes was changed in September all LEAs were given until December 1, 2006 to collect the data from students who entered programs between July 1, 2006 and September 30, 2006. The number of students that entered during that time frame will be small, therefore, sampling was ruled out and all LEAs will participate yearly in the U-POD process. The process is outlined below.

Methods used for data collection:

- The U-POD form is a state wide form that will be kept in the students' file. (The form has been renamed but the process and definitions are the same as developed by the ECO Center.)
- LEAs selected the data sources that will be used to collect preschool outcome data.
- LEAs submitted a list of data sources that may be used to collect data to Utah State Office of Education. That documentation is kept with the UPIPS monitoring off-site data information.
- It must be a team that determines students' ratings on each outcome.
- Teams that determine the student rating are documented on the U-POD form.
- The team documents which data sources were used on the U-POD form.

Data Collection:

- 2005-2006 "Entry" data was collected from all LEAs on students entering the programs from July 1, 2006 to September 30, 2006.
- Exit Data will start in FFY 2007 and will be collected from all students who exit the preschool special education program if student is in the program at least 6 months.
- There are two points of data collection. Data collection periods will be within 6 weeks of eligibility and when the student exits the preschool special education program.
- Data collection for all students will be documented using the state form, Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (U-POD) and retained in the students file.
- Categories 6 and 7 on the preschool outcomes scale define typical or same age peers.
- LEAs report entry and exit data every June 30th to Utah State Office of Education.
- Since there are 7 points on the U-POD rating scale, data will be translated using the ECO calculator, to determine the 5 OSEP categories.
- The U-POD process will be validated for fidelity. U-POD questions have been added to the UPIPS monitoring system and as LEAs are monitored for compliance, the U-POD process will be authenticated.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Entry Data

	# of Students Rated typical or same- age peers U-POD Rating 6 and 7	# of Students Rated Below same-age peers U-POD Rating 5,4,3,2, and 1
A.	144	913
B.	111	946
C.	216	841

Discussion of Baseline Data:

- Baseline data were taken for each new student entering special education preschool from July 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006.
- Baseline Data are divided by the ratings on U-POD that would be considered functioning at age level, which is #6 and #7, and those students that are functioning below age level, which is indicated by 5,4,3,2, and 1.
- Using the training scenarios, inter-rater reliability was high. Teams were trained and are using the rating scales accurately with congruence among teams using the process, leading to a belief that there are valid results.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Exit data for baseline will be reported in 2007 APR.
2006 (2006-2007)	Targets to be determined.
2007 (2007-2008)	Targets to be determined.
2008 (2008-2009)	Targets to be determined.
2009 (2009-2010)	Targets to be determined.
2010 (2010-2011)	Targets to be determined.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Activity	Timeline	Resources
1. Complete Early Childhood Guidelines	Completed	Part B 619 Coordinator, USOE Staff, and Stakeholder input.
2. Train preschool personnel on Pre-K Guidelines.	Completed July 2006 and ongoing through 2011	Part B 619 Coordinator, USOE Staff, and UPDC Staff IDEA Discretionary funds.
3. Collect pre-test data on entering students 2005-06.	Completed	EIRI and Districts, IDEA Discretionary funds.
4. Develop U-POD form	Completed	Stakeholders, UPDC staff, and Part B 619 Coordinator
5. Develop U-POD training	Completed	UPDC staff, and Part B 619 Coordinator
6. Develop U-POD collection tool for Entry Data	Completed	Part B 619 Coordinator
7. Collect Entry Data from students entering during the 2005 school year.	August 2006	Districts, and Part B 619 Coordinator
8. Develop a new system to measure student outcomes.	September 2006	Part B 619 Coordinator, USOE Staff, UPDC staff, and ECO Center,
9. Develop additional U-POD training	October 2006 - 2011	ECO Center, UPDC preschool specialist, and Part B 619 Coordinator
10. Train LEA personnel on preschool student outcomes system.	October 2006 - 2011	Part B 619 Coordinator, USOE Staff, UPDC preschool specialist.
11. Provide technical assistance to LEAs as they administer new preschool outcome system.	June 2006- June 2011	Part B 619 Coordinator, UPDC preschool specialist.
12. Exit data will be collected on all students who entered after July 1, 2006,	June 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011	Part B 619 Coordinator and all LEAs

<p>were in the program at least 6 months, and exit the program by June 30, 2007</p>		
<p>13. Provide 2 regional focus groups for stakeholders to provide input on U-POD targets and process.</p>	<p>September 2007- May2008</p>	<p>Stakeholders and Part B 619 Coordinator</p>
<p>14. Develop a tool that allows for feedback into U-POD process, analyze feedback and revise process as needed.</p>	<p>May 2007 and annually until 2011</p>	<p>Part B 619 Coordinator and UPDC preschool specialist, and USOE Data staff</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8- 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))

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.

Indicator 8: Response to required action. OSEP letter dated March 15, 2006.

The review of sampling plans articulated in a letter dated February 14, 2006 indicated that Utah's sampling plan needed to be corrected to include all LEAs with $n \geq 50,000$ each year. Utah has revised its sampling plan to include all LEAs with $n \geq 50,000$ students each year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Overview: Parents of students with disabilities are surveyed annually to determine if they perceive that schools facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Probability sampling with weighting was used to ensure that results of the survey could be generalized to the entire population.

Survey Instrument: A questionnaire called the "Parent Survey" was developed based upon a review of over ten surveys currently used in surrounding states and by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The newly developed survey incorporated many important elements from those surveys and consists of 36 questions. The resultant survey is a manageable document for parents. It uses a dichotomous scale (yes or no) rather than a Likert scale, because the questions focus on whether or not particular events occurred. The draft survey was subjected to an informal validation procedure. A small sample of parents, parent advocates, special education personnel, and school administrators responded to the survey, and the draft was revised into its final form based on their feedback. The parent survey will provide data for this indicator, and will also serve as an additional data source regarding parental input and participation for the state's monitoring process.

Target Population: The target population was the parents of all students with disabilities enrolled in public schools in Utah during the 2005-06 school year.

Sampling Frame: The sampling frame was the list of 60,089 students identified by LEAs as having an IEP in the December 2005 collection of student unit records via the USOE Data Clearinghouse. This was the same source used by the USOE to report special education counts to the U.S. Department of Education for the same school year.

Sample Design: Students were selected to the sample using a multistage stratified cluster design. In the first stage, LEAs, which served as the clusters, were stratified into three primary sampling units (PSU) by size and/or governance — regular school districts with 50,000 or more students, other regular school districts, and charter schools (which all function as their own agencies in Utah). LEAs in the first PSU were selected with certainty and will be included every year. LEAs in the other two PSUs were selected according to their turn as part of a cohort in a five year monitoring cycle. In the second stage, students in the selected clusters or LEAs with fewer than 100 special education students were sampled with

certainty. For each of the other LEAs, the sample size calculator at www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm was used to determine the minimum sample size which would provide an estimate within a range of plus or minus 5% at a 95% confidence level, as recommended by the U.S. Department of Education. Students within these LEAs were stratified by disability and ethnic status, and certain strata were selected with certainty or over sampled to obtain reliable estimates for low-incidence disabilities categories and ethnic minorities at the state level.

Weighting: The 2,504 students in the sample were assigned base weights which reflected the differential probability of their selection to the sample according to their membership in one of the possible combinations of primary sampling unit, cluster and demographic stratum. After data were collected, base weights for respondents were adjusted to account for nonresponse and represent the entire population. In other words, the weights originally assigned to the 1,911 nonrespondents were allocated across respondents and the final weights of the 593 respondents sum to the population.

Administration of the Questionnaire: USOE mailed letters explaining the purpose of the survey and blank questionnaires to parents of selected students. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included with each questionnaire to facilitate the return of the completed questionnaire. Each questionnaire was arbitrarily coded to uniquely identify the student. Parents whose preference was Spanish in communications with the LEA were sent a Spanish translation prepared by the USOE Educational Equity section. In addition, a Spanish-speaking representative was available by telephone for parent questions.

Data Coding: Two designated representatives at the USOE were trained and assigned to receive the returned questionnaires. A database was created in Microsoft Excel to record each response. A code was used to input yes, no, and no response responses for each unique student for whom a completed questionnaire was received. Handwritten comments were compiled for additional information for USOE use. By using both representatives to input and cross-check data, data coding accuracy was ensured.

Response Rate and Representativeness: Usable responses were received for 593 students, producing an effective response rate of 23.7%. Based on federal requirements, the analysis included 42 categories across five variables — gender, age group, ethnicity, disability, and local education agency (which indicates rurality among other things). All LEAs were represented in the sample.

Statistical Analysis: Responses were weighted to represent the entire population, and the percentage answering “yes” to each item for each category of interest was calculated with a technique similar to multiple regression with dummy variables (Multiple Classification Analysis-MCA) to control the potentially confounding effects of all other categories in the analysis.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Baseline analysis of the questionnaire data indicates that 91% of parents agreed that “my school facilitates my involvement as a means of improving services and results for my child with disabilities.” From the larger questionnaire of 36 questions, a subset of eleven items specifically designed to measure this issue was identified. The subset was selected by a focus group of SEA staff and contractors. This subset of questions was analyzed with MCA and expressed in standard deviations after composite scores derived from factor analysis on the subset were calculated for respondents.

FIGURE 1: Parent Survey Subset Questions

Subset Question Number	Question
1	Did you receive a copy of your procedural safeguards (parent's rights)?
3	If you speak a language other than English, does the school communicate with you in that language?
6	Did the evaluation team listen to and consider your input?
7	Were you invited to a meeting to discuss the results of your child's evaluation?
8	Was the IEP meeting scheduled at a mutually agreeable time?
14	Did you feel the team asked for and used your input on goals and objectives for your child's IEP?
26	Do you receive periodic reports on your child's progress toward IEP goals?
31	Does the school empower you to have a positive effect on the quality of your child's program?
32	Does the school facilitate opportunities for you to provide input about your child's education other than at IEP meetings?
33	Is there a school-home communication system in place that provides you the opportunity to exchange important information about your student as often as necessary?
34	Does your school facilitate your involvement as a means of improving services and results for your child with disabilities?

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The 91% was determined by weighting the 593 survey respondents to represent the target population (of 60,089 students); excluding the 43 respondents (representing 4,206 students) who did not answer either "yes" or "no" to this item; dividing the weighted number of respondents who indicated agreement (48,747) by the total number of respondents (55,883); and multiplying by 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Collect baseline data (91%) and set targets and improvement activities.
2006 (2006-2007)	Maintain baseline (91%) regarding the 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.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase from previous year by 0.1% regarding the 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.
2008 (2008-2009)	Increase from previous year by 0.1% regarding the 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.
2009 (2009-2010)	Increase from previous year by 0.1% regarding the 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.
2010 (2010-2011)	Increase from previous year by 0.1% regarding the 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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. Administer parent survey.	Spring each year	USOE staff, USOE support personnel, IDEA discretionary funds
2. Collect, record, and aggregate data from parent survey.	Summer each year	USOE staff, USOE support personnel, IDEA discretionary funds
3. Compare data collected to sampling plan to ensure adequate sample size and address issue of non-responders, if applicable.	Ongoing	USOE staff, contract personnel
4. Analyze data to determine areas that need improvement and areas of commendation.	Ongoing	USOE staff, contract personnel
5. Report data analysis results to LEAs annually.	Fall 2007-2011	USOE staff
6. Report data analysis results to Utah Parent Center annually.	Fall 2007-2011	USOE staff
7. Facilitate a focus group of LEAs and Utah Parent Center to determine effective maintenance strategies, effective practices and areas for improvement.	Fall 2007	USOE staff
8. Disseminate effective maintenance strategies and effective practices to LEAs.	Fall 2007	USOE staff
9. Establish and publish performance objectives for the items which fall below the state average or target.	Spring 2007 - 2011	USOE staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
--

Indicator 9- Percent 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)(A))
--

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

It was determined after the December 1, 2005 child count was completed and submitted to OSEP, and risk ratios were applied to all State and LEA data that a change was needed in determining a standard of significance pertaining to disproportionality for the State of Utah. In Utah's SPP we reported that we would use + or – 0.3 from the perfect risk ratio of 1.0 to determine significant disproportionality for Utah. Since the submission of the SPP we have reevaluated our data and have decided to use + or – 0.5 instead of 0.3 due to the number of small LEAs in Utah. Using the 0.5 risk ratio, we were able to target half of our LEAs for further evaluation of identification processes. The change in risk ratio gives us a better description of the small rural districts and Charter schools where small numbers tend to skew the data. Because of this process we are confident that the identification processes in the State ensure that racial and ethnic groups in special education are not over or under represented.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Thirty-six of 72 LEAs had one or more risk ratios that were above the + or – 0.5 risk ratio. After a careful review, 0.00% of inappropriate identification was found.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The use of the alternate risk ratio as suggested in the Westat technical assistance document allowed the USOE to look carefully to ensure small district and large districts were adequately reviewed. As reported above, we did find that 36 of the state's 72 LEAs were found to have one or more risk ratios that were above our + or – 0.5 risk ratio.

A careful review of all 36 LEAs that were above or below the + or – 0.5 risk ratio was conducted. The procedures included a review of policy and procedure manuals, and UPIPS monitoring data including student files, evaluation and identification procedures, and interviews with teachers, administrators, parents and students. It was determined that none of the LEAs had any significant disproportionality based on inappropriate identification. (0.00% inappropriate identification).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2006 (2006-2007)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2007 (2007-2008)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2008 (2008-2009)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2009 (2009-2010)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2010 (2010-2011)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. Determine a Standard of significance pertaining to disproportionality for Utah.	October 2005- December 2005 Completed	USOE Staff
2. Apply risk ratio formula to disaggregated 618 data at LEA and State levels.	February 2006 Completed	USOE Staff
3. Analyze disaggregated 618 data.	April 2006 Completed	USOE Staff
4. Identify LEAs with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education.	April 2006 Completed	USOE Staff
5. Using a review of policies and procedures as well as monitoring data, determine if the disproportionality could be the result of inappropriate identification practices.	January 2006 and Ongoing Completed for 2005	USOE Staff
6. Provide training to identified LEAs on evaluation and eligibility determination procedures.	2005-2011	USOE Staff, IDEA discretionary funds
7. Continue to collect, disaggregate, and compare 618 data.	2005-2011	USOE Staff
8. Monitor LEAs that were targeted for further evaluation to ensure sustainability of 0.00% disproportionality.	2006-2011	USOE Staff
9. Provide follow up technical assistance and/or sanctions based on identification of policies, procedures, and practices that lead to inappropriate identification.	2005-2011	USOE Staff
10. Collaborate to provide state wide conferences for all educators regarding classroom management, instruction,	2005-2011	USOE, and UPDC Staff, IDEA Discretionary Funds

school wide and targeted intervention to support students in LRE.		
11. Collaborate on program development of tiered instruction for all educators to support students in LRE.	September 2005 Ongoing	USOE, and UPDC Staff, IDEA Discretionary Funds
12. Participate with general curriculum staff to develop a state wide framework for literacy instruction including targeted interventions and assessment to ensure LRE for Students.	August 2005-February 2006 Ongoing	USOE and UPDC Staff
13. Collaborate in the publication of a technical assistance document for all educators which describes the statewide framework for literacy instruction.	August 2005-February 2006	USOE and UPDC Staff, IDEA Discretionary Funds
14. Collaborate with Comprehensive Guidance to train educators in behavior management strategies and targeted interventions to ensure LRE for students with disabilities.	September 2005	USOE and UPDC Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
--

Indicator 10- Percent 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

It was determined after the December 1, 2005 child count was completed and submitted to OSEP, and risk ratios were applied to all State and LEA data that a change was needed in determining a standard of significance pertaining to disproportionality for the State of Utah. In Utah's SPP we reported that we would use + or – 0.3 from the perfect risk ratio of 1.0 to determine significant disproportionality for Utah. Since the submission of the SPP we have reevaluated our data and have decided to use + or – 0.5 instead of 0.3 due to the number of small LEAs in Utah. Using the 0.5 risk ratio, we were able to target 27 of 72 LEAs for further evaluation of identification processes based on review of SLD, CD, ED, OHI, ID, and AUT data. Careful reviews were conducted of the remainder of the disability categories. Because of this process we are confident that the identification processes in the State ensure that racial and ethnic groups are not over or under represented in specific disability categories.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Twenty-seven of 72 LEAs had one or more risk ratios that were above + or – 0.5 risk ratio in the disability categories of SLD, CD, ED, OHI, ID, and AUT. After a careful review, 0.00% inappropriate identification was found.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The use of the alternate risk ratio as suggested in the Westat technical assistance document allowed us to look carefully to ensure small district and large districts were adequately reviewed. As reported above, we did find that 27 of 72 LEAs had one or more risk ratios that were above + or – 0.5 risk ratio in the disability categories of SLD, CD, ED, OHI, ID, AUT. After a careful review of the identification process in all LEAs using UPIPS Monitoring data, 0.00% inappropriate identification was found. The review procedures included a review of policy and procedure manuals, and the UPIPS monitoring data, including student files, evaluations and identification procedures, and interviews with teachers, administrators, parents and students.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2006 (2006-2007)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2007 (2007-2008)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2008 (2008-2009)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2009 (2009-2010)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%
2010 (2010-2011)	The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. Determine a standard of significance pertaining to disproportionality for Utah	October 2005- December 2005 Completed	USOE Staff
2. Apply risk ratio formula to disaggregated 618 data at LEA and State levels.	February 2006 Completed	USOE Staff
3. Analyze disaggregated 618 data	April 2006 Completed	USOE Staff
4. Identify LEAs with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education	April 2006 Completed	USOE Staff
5. Using a review of policies and procedures as well as monitoring data, determine if the disproportionality could be the result of inappropriate identification practices	January 2006 and Ongoing Completed for 2005	USOE Staff
6. Provide Training to identified LEAs on evaluation and eligibility determination procedures	2005-2011	USOE Staff, IDEA discretionary funds
7. Continue to collect, disaggregate, and compare 618 data	2005-2011	USOE Staff
8. Monitor LEAs that were targeted for further evaluation to ensure sustainability of 0.00% disproportionality.	2006-2011	USOE Staff

9. Provide follow up technical assistance and/or sanctions based on identification of policies, procedures, and practices that lead to inappropriate identification	2005-2011	USOE Staff
10. Collaborate to provide state wide conferences for all educators regarding classroom management, instruction, school wide and targeted intervention to support students in LRE	2005-2011	USOE, and UPDC Staff, IDEA Discretionary Funds
11. Collaborate on program development of tiered instruction for all educators to support students in LRE	September 2005 Ongoing	USOE, and UPDC Staff, IDEA Discretionary Funds
12. Participate with general curriculum staff to develop a state wide framework for literacy instruction including targeted interventions and assessment to ensure LRE for Students	August 2005-February 2006 Ongoing	USOE and UPDC Staff
13. Collaborate in the publication of a technical assistance document for all educators which describes the statewide framework for literacy instruction.	August 2005-February 2006	USOE and UPDC Staff, IDEA Discretionary Funds
14. Collaborate with Comprehensive Guidance to train educators in behavior management strategies and targeted interventions to ensure LRE for students with disabilities.	September 2005	USOE and UPDC Staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/ Child Find
--

Indicator 11- Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and the evaluation completed within 60 days. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a, but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The initial evaluation/eligibility timeline used by the state remains the IDEA-established 60 days. USOE uses data collected during the annual state monitoring process (UPIPS) to determine if initial eligibility determination was made within 60 days of parental consent. LEAs are selected for state monitoring after being assigned to a cohort based upon location and size. The balance of the number and size of school districts and charter schools in each year of the five year cycle has been previously determined so that the resources of the USOE can meet the needs of the required activities. Each LEA is monitored each year throughout the five years. The UPIPS monitoring process places increased responsibility on each LEA by involving them in a continuous cycle of identification and improvement. In Year 1, the LEA is charged with involving key stakeholders in the development of a Self-Assessment Report that analyzes the LEA's effectiveness in ensuring compliance and improving results for students. The LEA then develops a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and Program Improvement Plan (PIP) that targets areas identified as needing improvement and aligns those identified areas with LEA interventions designed to correct them. During Year 2, based upon an off-site review of the LEA data, submitted as part of the Self-Assessment Report and from annual 618 data, an on-site visit may be scheduled in which random student files will be reviewed for each visited LEA to collect additional data that validate the accuracy of the LEAs' self-collected data and to determine if improvement efforts, as part of the CAP and PIP, have been successful. Years 3-5 of the UPIPS process tracks the status of each LEAs' CAP and PIP, including the correction of identified compliance errors. The CAP is evaluated each year for evidence of completion of activities and results of those activities are then verified through additional student file reviews and 618 data. Some LEAs may have multiple on-site visits based upon their annual data.

The computerized file review program (UPIPS-SRR) used in the monitoring process, and which is available for individual LEA use, has been modified to collect data on initial evaluation timelines, including the range of days and reasons for exceeding the timeline, when applicable. Files of both students determined eligible for special education and students determined not eligible for special education are reviewed annually by both the USOE and LEAs.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

76% of all reviewed files documented initial eligibility was determined within 60 days of receipt of parental consent.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

During the 2005-2006 school year, files of students receiving an initial evaluation (regardless of final eligibility decision) were reviewed as part of the UPIPS monitoring process. During the 2005-2006 school year, 22 LEAs were monitored for this requirement through either self-assessments or on-site visits. 42 files were reviewed; consent from parents to evaluate was received for 42 students, and 34 students were found eligible for services under IDEA. There were 10 findings of noncompliance on the initial evaluation 60-day timeline (2 of the findings were for students later found not eligible) in 6 LEAs. The 6 LEAs were notified that the noncompliance would have to be corrected within one year, and the State will do a follow-up to ensure that the LEAs have corrected their procedures regarding this timeline. Of the 10 initial evaluations that exceeded 60 days, one evaluation was completed in 62 days and the lengthiest evaluation took 138 days, with the average number of days of evaluation at 87.3. Reasons were not documented by LEAs for exceeding the timeline. The need for this documentation has been and will continue to be reinforced in upcoming LEA trainings, state meetings, and by formal letter. LEAs will also be notified that USOE will be requesting documentation of reasons for exceeding the timeline. All LEAs were notified of the timeline requirement during state meetings held on June 23, 2005, September 15-16, 2005 and November 2-3, 2006. The timeline requirement was also included in all SEA trainings.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	One hundred (100) percent of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.
2006 (2006-2007)	One hundred (100) percent of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.
2007 (2007-2008)	One hundred (100) percent of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.
2008 (2008-2009)	One hundred (100) percent of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.
2009 (2009-2010)	One hundred (100) percent of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.
2010 (2010-2011)	One hundred (100) percent of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. Update state monitoring computerized file review program (UPIPS-SRR) to include specific questions regarding initial evaluation timeline.	Completed	USOE staff, contract personnel, IDEA discretionary funds
2. Train state monitoring file reviewers on UPIPS-SRR program changes with regard to 60-day timeline for initial evaluations with respect to timelines, eligibility, and documenting range/reasons if timeline is exceeded.	Completed	USOE staff, USOE contract reviewers, IDEA discretionary funds
3. Inform/train LEAs of new data collection requirements regarding initial evaluations with respect to timelines, eligibility, and range/reasons if timeline is exceeded.	September 2005 – ongoing	USOE staff, UPDC staff, IDEA discretionary funds
4. Monitor for initial evaluation timelines within each LEA and document reasons timeline was exceeded, if applicable.	October 2005-ongoing	USOE staff, contract reviewers, IDEA discretionary funds
5. Analyze monitoring data regarding initial evaluations with respect to timelines, eligibility, and documenting range/reasons if timeline is exceeded.	October 2005-ongoing	USOE staff
6. Provide LEA level data to LEAs on their status regarding initial evaluations timelines, eligibility, and range/reasons if timeline is exceeded.	October 2005 - ongoing	USOE staff
7. Train special education teachers statewide on initial evaluation timeline requirements.	September 2005-ongoing	USOE staff
8. Develop a Monitoring Steering Committee with representation from charter schools, small districts, medium districts, large districts, parents of students with disabilities, and representation from the Utah Special Education Advisory Committee. The Monitoring Steering Committee will provide feedback with the development of a “Framework for Assistance and Interventions,” which will specify enforcement actions.	Summer 2006-Spring 2007	USOE staff, IDEA discretionary funds
9. Revise State Special Education Rules to include 60-day timeline.	Fall 2006-May 2007	USOE staff, UPDC staff, IDEA discretionary funds
10. Develop and disseminate a parent training manual, in conjunction with the Utah Parent Center, which clarifies the evaluation process, including timeline requirements, as well as the school and parent responsibilities.	January 2007 - ongoing	USOE staff, UPC staff

11. Provide statewide training for special education teachers, related service providers, evaluators on updated Utah State Special Education Rules.	June 2006-ongoing	USOE staff, UPDC staff, IDEA discretionary funds
12. Enhance Corrective Action Plan (CAP) requirements to require additional LEA level training and an additional review of student files to determine evaluation timelines, reasons timelines were not met (if applicable), and the development/implementation of LEA actions to overcome the identified reasons so that evaluations are completed within timelines.	Fall 2006-Spring 2006	USOE staff
13. Provide follow-up training to LEAs, as needed, based upon ongoing monitoring results regarding initial evaluation timelines.	2005-2011	USOE staff , UPDC staff, IDEA discretionary funds
14. Implement focused monitoring process to provide additional technical assistance and review LEAs that continue to not meet targets.	2007 - ongoing	USOE staff , IDEA discretionary funds

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for who parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. 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)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	One hundred (100) percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Indicator 12: Response to noncompliance. OSEP letter dated March 15, 2006.

2004-2005 data for reporting of number of children served in Part B and referred to Part C for eligibility determination, as well as those children referred and found not eligible whose eligibilities were determined prior to their 3rd birthdays are now included in the SPP. All required measurements in reporting baseline data in Indicator 12 are now included. The system put in place by Part B tracks all students that are referred by Part C. The correction has been documented in this APR. Parts C and B coordinated to collect more accurate and complete transition information.

Required Action	Action Completed	Results
Include all required data and calculations in reporting its performance. (Baseline data, FFY 2004 and progress data, FFY 2005).	For FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 the incorrect labeling of charts was corrected.	Data are now accurately reported.
Review and revise improvement strategies to include data that demonstrate full compliance with 34CFR 300.§132(b).	Parts C implemented a new electronic system to better track students as they exit Part C. Part B developed and implemented a method to track students referred from Part C to Part B.	The efforts have resulted in more accurate and complete transitioning information. The 2005-2006 system indicates that Part B is now tracking 100% of students referred to Part B from Part C.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Target was not met.

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 64% of eligible students received FAPE by their 3rd birthday. The target was 100%. Students referred from Part C that were found eligible or not eligible and have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday increased to 75%.

FFY 2005-2006 data

# of LEAs monitored with preschool students	7
# of LEAs with noncompliance	5

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.

Chart A

a. # students referred to Part B	b. # of students found not eligible/ eligibilities determined prior to 3 rd birthdays.	c. # of students found eligible and implemented by 3 rd birthday	d. Parent refusal caused delay in evaluation	Students found eligible and have an IEP by their 3 rd birthday	Students not included in either a, b, or c.
176	22	115	4	75%	19

The range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed was from 1 to 180 days. The reasons for delay are listed below.

- Summer birthdays
- Evaluation extended because additional testing was needed or requested by team members.
- Related services providers not available to complete testing within the time frame.
- Students with birthdays falling later in the year team agreed on fall testing.
- Evaluation tools used provide more accurate results when assessed closer to the third birthday.
- Parents and team unable to agree on all elements of the IEP.
- Parent, related service providers, and other team members unable to coordinate the meeting within the time frame.
- When a student from Part C does not meet eligibility criteria additional testing provided to determine if all areas have been accurately assessed.

Students not included in either a, b, or c were due to the following reasons

- Parent did not attend the transition meeting.
- Parent refused services.
- Students had not turned 3 within the timeframe of this report.
- Parents moved.
- Student deceased.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Develop a system/method for Part B to collect transition student data. Completed.
 - More data was required through the monitoring process to provide a larger N size upon which to draw statewide conclusion on how many students were found eligible and an IEP in effect before their third birthday. Therefore, during FFY 2005 districts in the UPIPS cycle provided information for all students referred from Part C. The N size increased from 8 students to 176 students.
2. Continue to meet with Part C quarterly to coordinate information to improve transition for students and families. Completed.
 - Meeting quarterly with Part C worked to provide the relationship to assist both agencies to work together to understand and improve data collection systems.
 - Part C and Part B developed a transition training that was presented at the Special Education Preschool Conference. Twenty people attended that training consisting of Part B and Part C providers. In addition Part C and Part B providers that have been working together successfully and providing smooth transitions for students presented at the Family Links Conference.
3. Work with Part C data specialist to identify districts and providers that need state technical assistance and/or training on transitions. Completed and ongoing.
 - Part C used BTOTS program to collect data by districts
 - Part B developed a new data collection system to identify districts that are in need of technical assistance.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005 (2005-06):

Progress:

- In FFY 2005 64% of the students were identified and their IEP in effect before their 3rd birthday. The FFY 2006 data indicate that there was an 11% increase. The data indicates that 75% of the students were found eligible or not eligible and an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.

Slippage:

- Additional activities have been developed to ensure that noncompliance is corrected.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activities	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. For identified LEAs provide training on eligible, not eligible, and IEP in effect by 3,	August 2007-2010	Utah State Office of Education 619 Coordinator and UPDC preschool specialist.	LEAs that do not have 100% compliance need to determine why so that solutions can be implemented.
2. Track LEAs that did not reach the target of 100%	February 2007 and ongoing thru 2010	Utah State Office of Education 619 Coordinator and UPDC preschool specialist.	Target requires 100% compliance.
3. Develop an electronic way to collect data.	February 2007 – August 2007	Utah State Office of Education 619 Coordinator	It is the efficient way to ensure accurate data.
4. Train LEAs on the data collection method.	October 2007- June-2008	Utah State Office of Education 619 Coordinator and data system personnel.	Data input is accurate when there is knowledge of the questions being asked.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/ Effective Transition
--

Indicator 13- Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

USOE collected data from state monitoring. Utah's monitoring system, Utah's Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS), operates on a five- year cycle. LEAs were selected for state monitoring after being assigned to a cohort based upon location and size. The balance of the number and size of school districts and charter schools in each year of the five year cycle has been previously determined so that the resources of the USOE can meet the needs of the required activities. Charter schools enter the cohort during their second year of operation. The objectives of UPIPS are to:

- Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Connect LEA and school improvement efforts with IDEA requirements.
- Support each LEA in the process of self-assessment and evaluation of compliance and program effectiveness.
- Link program improvement activities with personnel development training.

The activities in the UPIPS five-year cycle are:

- Year 1: Self-assessment and development of program improvement plan
- Year 2: Implementation of self-assessment findings and possible on-site validation visit from USOE
- Year 3: Implementation of program improvement plan and corrective action plan; verification of results of corrective actions
- Year 4: Continued implementation of program improvement plan and corrective action plan; verification of results of corrective actions
- Year 5: Continued implementation of program improvement plan and corrective action plan; verification of results of corrective actions

LEAs are required to report correction, and submit evidence of that correction, of any identified systemic and non-systemic compliance errors on the corrective action plan (CAP) within one year of receiving written notification of non-compliance. LEAs may gather the file review data or may request USOE assistance to gather the required data. CAP updates are required to be submitted annually.

The 2005 revision of UPIPS provides for additional levels of SEA support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues during previous UPIPS cycles, creating a process that is differentiated by results.

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-06):

Baseline data indicate that 78% of LEAs (29 of 37 LEAs) monitored that served transition aged students, met compliance requirements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data from UPIPS monitoring indicated that 78% of the LEAs monitored met the compliance requirements for transition IEPs, based on the file review instrument in place at the time. The file review instrument was developed in response to IDEA 2004 requirements, as effective July 1, 2005: the instrument was implemented with the first LEA visits in early Fall 2005 and continued with all LEA monitoring visits during the school year. Information received later in 2005-2006 from NSTTAC through the Indicator 13 checklist, and OSEP through the IDEA 2004 final regulations, gave additional direction that resulted in modification of the file review instrument that will be used during 2006-2007. In addition, the data collection system was modified to more accurately report the data required for this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline data collection
2006 (2006-2007)	One hundred (100) percent of youth aged 16 and above, in LEAs monitored, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals.
2007 (2007-2008)	One hundred (100) percent of youth aged 16 and above, in LEAs monitored, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals.
2008 (2008-2009)	One hundred (100) percent of youth aged 16 and above, in LEAs monitored, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals.
2009 (2009-2010)	One hundred (100) percent of youth aged 16 and above, in LEAs monitored, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals.
2010 (2010-2011)	One hundred (100) percent of youth aged 16 and above, in LEAs monitored, have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. Determine criteria for coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services	Winter, 2005 Completed	SEA staff, NSTTAC
2. Update state monitoring computerized file review program to include specific questions regarding coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services	Winter, 2005 Completed	Contractor, IDEA discretionary funds
3. Train state monitoring file reviewers to recognize coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services	Winter, 2005 Completed	SEA staff
4. Monitor for coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services.	Winter, 2005-Spring, 2006 Completed	SEA staff, contracted staff, IDEA discretionary funds, LEAs in UPIPS cohort, UPIPS SRR software
5. Analyze monitoring data regarding coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services	Winter, 2005-Spring, 2006 Completed	SEA staff, UPIPS SRR software
6. Modify state monitoring computerized file review program and data collection system as needed to reflect changes in IDEA 2004 and Indicator 13 requirements.	Summer, 2006 Completed	Contractor, IDEA discretionary funds
7. Provide training to secondary special education teachers statewide to write IEPs containing coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services	Spring, 2006 - Fall, 2007 - Ongoing	State transition specialist, LEA staff, LEA special education director and special education staff
8. Re-collect data on LEA compliance status after training	Spring, 2007 - Ongoing	SEA staff, LEA staff, UPIPS contracted staff, UPIPS SRR software
9. Provide training opportunities, designed to meet transition requirements, to LEAs in self-assessment year	Spring 2007 - Ongoing	SEA staff, LEA staff, UPIPS contracted staff, UPIPS SRR software
10. Provide follow-up training as needed based upon ongoing monitoring results regarding coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services	Ongoing	SEA staff, LEA staff, UPIPS contracted staff, UPIPS SRR software
11. Follow up to monitor correction of non-compliance to ensure 100% compliance within one year.	2006-2007 and ongoing	SEA staff, LEA staff, UPIPS contracted staff, UPIPS SRR software

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/ Effective Transition
--

Indicator 14- Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))
--

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A request for proposals, developed by USOE/Special Education staff, was issued in October, 2006 requesting submission of proposals to collect data from all school leavers, who had been served under an IEP, in 2004-2005. The RFP included background information about the State Performance Plan and Annual Progress Report requirements, including specific information about Indicator 14. Student "leavers" were defined as those who have either graduated with a diploma, reached maximum age, dropped out during the school year, or did not return to school for the current year. The RFP specified that USOE/Special Education would provide the contact information for all school "leavers" and the survey that would be used to collect the required information. One award would be made for a three year contract, with the possibility of extension of the contract for the duration of the current SPP. USOE will review contractor performance annually in the following areas: reports submitted by deadlines; reports meet specifications outlined in the RFP; protection of confidential information; and thoroughness of information and data collected.

Proposals were to be submitted to USOE/Special Education by end of work, November 3, 2006. The five proposals received were reviewed by USOE/Special Education staff and the decision was made to offer the contract to the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC). Funding for the project will be available January 1, 2007 with all work to be completed and the final report to be submitted by the MPRRC to USOE/Special Education on December 1, 2007.

There are four districts in Utah with over 50,000 students; one district has less than 150 students enrolled. In 2004-2005, the largest district had approximately 400 "leavers", while the smallest district reported no students, who had IEPs, leaving during that same year. In order to be able to provide the LEAs with data that could be used for program planning specific to that LEA, and with the relatively small number of "leavers" annually, the decision was made to use a census survey for all but the four large LEAs, rather than sampling. Survey recipients from the largest LEAs will be selected using a sampling process developed by MPRRC staff: this sample will be weighted to assure that the sample selected will be representative of each LEA. The MPRRC will be responsible for contacting all students who had IEPs and who had left school during the 2004-2005 school year. The USOE and the MPRRC will annually evaluate continued use of the census, rather than sampling LEAs.

Student information for OSEP reports is regularly submitted to USOE by LEAs and stored in the USOE Data Clearinghouse; reports are generated from the Clearinghouse. Data generated for this survey include: student name, birth date, gender and ethnicity, last known telephone number, disability based on special education disability eligibility, LEA, and exit code. The MPRRC will use this information to contact all students; the surveyor will interview the student (18 or older), the student (under 18) and parent, or the parent if the student is unable or unavailable to be interviewed. Interviews will be conducted using a telephone survey annually between April 1 and September 30, beginning April, 2007.

The survey instrument is designed to gather post-school outcomes in the required areas; students' involvement in competitive employment or post-secondary school, or both. Competitive employment is

defined as full (≥ 35 hours/week) or part time (< 35 hours/week) employment in an integrated/community setting at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the compensation and level of benefits that the same employer pays other workers doing the same job do not have disabilities. Surveyors will ask if the individual is receiving less than minimum wage, minimum wage, or more than minimum wage and if the pay and level of benefits is the same as others doing the same job, as far as the individual knows (this is based on Utah Division of Rehabilitative Services procedures for determination of competitive employment status). Post-secondary school may be a high school completion program (e.g. Adult Education or G.E.D. program), short-term education or employment training program (e.g. WIA, Job Corps), vocational/technical school, community college or other 2-year college, college/university (4-year college), or church mission or other humanitarian service. The last option was included because of the significant number of Utah young men and women serving church missions and the extensive training provided.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Student information for OSEP reports is regularly submitted to USOE by LEAs and stored in the USOE Data Clearinghouse; reports are generated from the Clearinghouse. Data generated for this survey includes: student name, birth date, gender and ethnicity, last known telephone number, disability based on special education disability eligibility, LEA, and exit code. Baseline data will be available Dec. 1, 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline data, available December 1, 2007, will be used to determine targets.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	Collect baseline data and set targets and improvement activities
2007 (2007-2008)	Target to be determined
2008 (2008-2009)	Target to be determined
2009 (2009-2010)	Target to be determined
2010 (2010-2011)	Target to be determined

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring complaints hearings etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	The USOE general supervision system (including Monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects one hundred (100) percent of the noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target not met.

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated correction rates of noncompliance within 1 year at 79.7% (average of state complaints, systemic, and nonsystemic). Target was 100% correction of all noncompliance within one year. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 7.1% increase (average of priority areas) to 86.8%.

	(FFY 2005)
FAPE	# of LEAs Monitored = 51
	# of LEAs with Noncompliance = 17
	% of LEAs with Noncompliance = 33%
	# of Findings of Noncompliance = 66
	# Corrected within 1 year = 58
	% Corrected within 1 year = 88%
	* 8 remaining uncorrected findings in 3 LEAs, which are being tracked for correction
General Supervision	# of LEAs Monitored = 51
	# of LEAs with Noncompliance = 12
	% of LEAs with Noncompliance = 24%
	# of Findings of Noncompliance = 57
	# Corrected within 1 year = 49
	% Corrected within 1 year = 86%
	* 8 remaining uncorrected findings in 3 LEAs, which are being tracked for correction

	(FFY2005)
Parent Involvement	# of LEAs Monitored = 51
	# of LEAs with Noncompliance = 11
	% of LEAs with Noncompliance = 22%
	# of Findings of Noncompliance = 42
	# Corrected within 1 year = 33
	% Corrected within 1 year = 79%
	* 9 remaining uncorrected findings in 4 LEAs, which are being tracked for correction

	(FFY2005)
Transitions	# of LEAs Monitored = 51
	# of LEAs with Noncompliance = 11
	% of LEAs with Noncompliance = 22%
	# of Findings of Noncompliance = 17
	# Corrected within 1 year = 17
	% Corrected within 1 year = 100%

	(FFY2005)
Utah Requirements	# of LEAs Monitored = 51
	# of LEAs with Noncompliance = 7
	% of LEAs with Noncompliance = 14%
	# of Findings of Noncompliance = 8
	# Corrected within 1 year = 8
	% Corrected within 1 year = 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Revise monitoring program (UPIPS-SRR)/manual to reflect changes in IDEA 2004 and monitoring priority areas. Completed.
 - The Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) is the system used for monitoring by the USOE. UPIPS is a continuous 5 year cycle of monitoring that includes all LEAs in the state. The UPIPS Student Record Review (UPIPS-SRR) is a computerized system used within the state to review special education files for compliance. The program was revised on October 15, 2005 to be consistent with IDEA 2004 final regulations. The UPIPS and UPIPS-SRR is used not only as a compliance monitoring tool, but also as a training tool for teachers and special education directors across the state, as it provides a systematic way to look at IDEA requirements in all areas. 15 trainings were conducted at both the LEA (63) and SEA level on UPIPS and UPIPS-SRR with a total of 203 participants. During the 2005-2006 school year, Utah had a total of 78 LEAs. This training was presented to 81% of the LEAs. Not all LEAs attended UPIPS trainings, 12 LEAs were brand new charter schools and 3 LEAs were school districts who had implemented their own, state approved monitoring system.
2. Utilize UPIPS and UPIPS-SRR program to collect data on LEA compliance. Completed (and ongoing).
 - The UPIPS monitoring data was collected from all LEAs
 - The UPIPS-SRR was used to collect data from the SEA level from 24 LEAs and was known to be used at the LEA level, for self-assessment, additional data collection, and training for 12 LEAs
3. Track correction of LEA areas of noncompliance within 1 year timeline. Completed (and ongoing).
 - A database was created and is maintained frequently (as LEA submit data) to track progress of each LEA in their correction of noncompliance.
 - The database is grouped by UPIPS year.
 - The database shows all UPIPS requirements for each year.
 - The database is used to record both deadlines and dates of corrections.
 - As the data is received, it is checked for accuracy by SEA staff, and approval is documented on the database.
 - A formal letter is then sent to the LEA updating them on the approval of submitted data and current status on UPIPS requirements.
 - Correction of non-compliance within the one year timeline is documented and tracked from written notification from USOE to LEA of non-compliance to official notification from USOE to LEA stating the non-compliance is corrected.
4. Conduct training for LEAs in areas of uncorrected noncompliance. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Training was conducted by the SEA on uncorrected noncompliance for 10 LEAs.
 - Training was mandatory for 7 LEAs who had not corrected their noncompliance within the one year timeline.
5. Conduct training for LEA Directors of Special Education on documentation of correction of noncompliance identified through state formal complaints, mediations, resolution sessions, and due process hearing decisions. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Training was conducted by the SEA for all LEAs at a state-wide meeting on 9/04 and 3/05.
6. Automate the tracking system for correction of noncompliance identified through state formal complaints, mediations, resolution sessions, and due process hearing decisions. Completed.
 - Previous data was kept in the form of hand written data in individual files. Data is now kept in a computerized data base.

7. Evaluate the results of activities from 2005 – 06 and determine additional activities based on those data. Completed (and ongoing).

- LEA activity results are evaluated as they are received by the SEA, which provides the individual LEAs with immediate feedback and support, as needed.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- The implementation of several activities has resulted in a significant increase in correction of non-compliance within LEAs within one year. LEAs are regularly informed of their progress and follow-up visits are scheduled by the USOE if timely and accurate data are not submitted documenting correction of noncompliance. LEAs have participated in multiple conversations regarding the importance of corrections, ways to document the correction, and have responded positively to the requirements, as they now can see the correlation of this indicator with the SPP. During this data period, all LEAs with nonsystemic issues corrected 100% of those issues and submitted documentation of those corrections to the USOE within 1 year. In addition, all LEAs with noncompliance identified through the state complaint process corrected 100% of their procedural errors and submitted documentation of those corrections to the USOE within 1 year.

Slippage:

- Although significant progress has been made on this indicator, Utah has not yet met the target of 100% compliance. Not all LEAs met the required timelines for submitting documentation of the correction of noncompliance. Follow up visits have been scheduled with these LEAs. In addition, two activities have been added to the SPP to address this by promoting a better understanding of the process.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Provide training opportunities to LEAs in self-assessment year on areas of concern statewide.	Spring 2007 – ongoing	USOE Staff, UPDC Staff, IDEA discretionary funds	Providing proactive training on areas of statewide concern will increase practitioner understanding of requirements resulting in compliance and positive practices before noncompliance is documented.
2. Target SEA training in the areas with continued noncompliance (i.e. FAPE, General Supervision, and Parent Involvement) by providing multiple training opportunities and methods to LEAs.	October 2006 – ongoing	USOE staff, UPDC staff, IDEA discretionary funds	Training opportunities have been increased by offering training through email, on-line, newsletters, phone, and in-person. These multiple training methods allow the SEA to reach a larger portion of the intended audience, as well as to follow-up on previous trainings to clarify issues, resulting in systemic change.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60 day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 2005 - 2006	One hundred (100) percent of signed written complaints will have reports issued or be otherwise resolved within the 60 –day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target met.

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 90% of written complaints were resolved within 60 days. The target was a 10% increase. Current data (2005-2006) demonstrate a 10% increase to 100%.

	FFY 2004 (2004-05)	FFY 2005 (2005-06)
Complaints resolved within 60-day timeline	18/20 90%	9/9 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. To address the workload of State and Federal Compliance Officer and ensure 100% compliance, hire additional personnel and separate dispute resolution responsibilities from monitoring. Completed.
 - In the past, the State and Federal Compliance Officer was responsible for monitoring as well as State and Federal compliance. Utah's LEAs increased from 40 district LEAs to 99 LEAs, including charter schools. This growth greatly increased the workload for technical assistance, monitoring, and other compliance related activities. To address this workload and improve, among other things, all targets pertaining to compliance, a position was created for a State Monitoring Specialist. This position was filled in February 2004.
2. Analyze the reasons that 10% of the decisions were not completed within the timelines and seek solutions. Completed.
 - Reasons that the 10% of the decisions were not completed within the timelines were analyzed. As a result, a position was created for a state monitoring specialist.
3. Continue quarterly meetings with Disability Law Center (P&A) to coordinate efforts on state formal complaints. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Two meetings were held between November 2005 and May 2006.
4. Examine the usefulness of the two-tier state formal complaint system as part of preparing to write new state special education rules to implement IDEA 2004 and the final regulations, when released. Completed.
 - Review of other states' complaint systems, conducted via the investigators list serve, was completed.
 - Stakeholder input was gathered, including LEAs, parent groups, advocacy agencies, USOE staff, and IHEs.
 - Four input sessions were held between March 20, 2006 and June 16, 2006.
5. Evaluate the results of activities from 2005 – 2006 and determine additional activities based on those data. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Activities were evaluated and additional activities based on the data are included in this APR.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- After training the new specialist, the Compliance Officer has been able to address complaint appeals more expeditiously. This measure has contributed to meeting the timeline for state complaints.
- The USOE has endeavored to build a collaborative relationship with the Disability Law Center (DLC) in order to resolve conflicts in a more expeditious, amicable manner and to identify and address potential problems proactively to prevent dispute. In addition to quarterly meetings, the Compliance Officer and USOE Specialists effectively communicate and collaborate with the DLC for purposes of acquiring stakeholder input and providing technical assistance training. This collaborative relationship benefits all stakeholders and has contributed to reducing the number of due process hearing requests filed.
- During the 2005 – 2006 school year, Utah successfully met the target goal of resolving 100% of the complaints filed within the 60 day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. We strongly believe that the activities undertaken contributed to meeting the target by:

- Reducing the workload of the Compliance Officer to allow for more expeditious completion of complaint appeal investigations and reports; and
 - Facilitating more effective communication with the Disability Law Center, Protection and Advocacy Agency, thereby enabling potential topics of complaints to be addressed proactively and actual complaints to be resolved earlier.
- Early dispute resolution procedures, including facilitated IEP meetings and mediation at earlier stages of disputes, contributed to reduced filings of formal state complaints by greater than 50%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Continue quarterly meetings with Disability Law Center (P&A) to coordinate efforts on state formal complaints.	December 2005 and ongoing	State Director of Special Education, Compliance Coordinator, P&A staff	The timeline was adjusted because this activity was successful in facilitating communication, coordinating efforts on state formal complaints, and contributed to reduced filing of formal state complaints, all of which contributed to meeting the 100% target.
2. Continue to develop Utah's system of dispute resolution in order to encourage more productive communication as early resolution of problems.	2006-2011	Compliance Coordinator, IDEA funds, P&A, UPC	Utah strives to resolve IDEA disputes as early as possible. Because this system of dispute resolution facilitates improved relationships between eligible students and their families as well as contributes to maintaining the 100% target goal, this dispute resolution system will continue to be nurtured and developed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45 day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005 - 2006)	One hundred (100) percent of due process hearing requests will have hearings completed within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target met.

Baseline data (2004-2005): 100%. Target was 100%. Current data (2005-2006):100%.

Four requests for due process hearings were received during the 2005 – 2006 school year. All four requests were filed by parents and were settled within the 45 day timeline or a timeline properly extended.

	FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	FFY 2005 (2005-2006)
Requests settled within 45 day timeline	3/3 100%	4/4 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Complete training of current DPHOs to update on requirements of the new 2004 IDEA statute. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Training in December 2005 was completed by consultant attorney.
2. Recruit additional DPHO candidates who meet the 2004 statutory recommendations for expertise, as needed. Completed (and ongoing).
3. Notify LEA and parent of required timelines upon every request for a due process hearing. Completed (and ongoing).
 - LEAs and parents were notified of required timelines upon every request.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- Utah strongly encourages mediation or facilitation as a way to resolve disputes in the most expeditious and amicable fashion. Mediation or facilitation is always offered and encouraged at the onset of the due process hearing resolution session. All due process hearing requests filed were settled during the resolution session time period or with an extension of the time period by mutual agreement. All hearing requests filed utilized facilitation or mediation to facilitate resolution.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Complete training for current DPHOs to update on the final IDEA regulations issued in August 2006 and the new Utah Special Education Rules when completed.	2007-2008	Compliance Officer, IDEA funds, consultant attorney	Now that the final regulations have been issued, Utah will update its special education rules. Once the rules development process is complete, DPHOs need to receive training.
2. Explore the possibility of merging the pool of Hearing Officers for IDEA due process hearings with the pool utilized for the Utah Professional Practices Performance Commission.	2007-2008	State Director of Special Education, Compliance Officer, USOE Staff Attorneys, USOE staff as needed.	Because Utah has so few due process hearing requests that are fully adjudicated, it is a challenge to keep DPHOs interested in attending the training required to remain eligible for our panel. By merging the two groups of hearing officers, we may be able to expand the number of hearing officers available by providing increased opportunities to serve.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Mandatory resolution sessions will be conducted by LEAs in each instance where a request for a due process hearing is made by a parent. During the drafting of the revised Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules, the required resolution session will be addressed. The State and Federal Compliance Officer began collecting the required information on resolution sessions held and settlement agreements reached as of July 1, 2005.

Baseline Data:

Data was taken for each resolution session conducted by LEAs as a result of a parent request for due process hearing.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The FFY 05 APR, currently being submitted, provides the 2005-2006 baseline data for Indicator #18. Baseline data was taken for each resolution session conducted by LEAs as a result of a parent request for due process hearing. Only four (4) requests for due process hearings were received during the 2005-2006 year. During that time, one hundred (100) percent of all requests for due process hearings filed resulted in settlement. While we are extremely pleased with the baseline data, we believe that regularly expecting this level of success is impracticable and contrary to the spirit of the law. Utah's commitment to early and alternative dispute resolution contributes to the low numbers of due process hearing requests. Because Utah currently has very few due process hearing requests, measurable and rigorous targets are mindful of those numbers and the USOE's recognition that a few issues will not be adequately resolved absent a hearing officer's ruling. We respect the parties right to obtain a ruling on the merits.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	Baseline data year – All four (4) requests for due process hearings filed resulted in settlement.
2006 (2006-2007)	Seventy-five (75) percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved during the mandatory resolution session.
2007 (2007-2008)	Seventy-five (75) percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved during the mandatory resolution session.
2008 (2008-2009)	Eighty (80) percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved during the mandatory resolution session.
2009 (2009-2010)	Eighty (80) percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved during the mandatory resolution session.
2010 (2010-2011)	Eighty-five (85) percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved during the mandatory resolution session.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Activity	Timeline	Resources
1. Solicit input from stakeholders regarding the desire for facilitators to participate in the resolution sessions.	Completed (and ongoing)	USOE technology (including email), meetings with stakeholders, support staff
2. Train facilitators for resolution sessions in the requirements of the resolution session in case LEAs wish to access their services during the baseline year.	Completed (and ongoing)	USOE staff, materials for training, IDEA discretionary funds
3. Provide training for LEA special education directors, superintendents association and parent groups.	2005 and ongoing.	USOE staff
4. Collect complete data on use and results of resolution sessions for each due process hearing request.	July 1 , 2005 – June 30, 2006	USOE staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005 (2005 – 2006)	Eighty (80) percent of mediations will result in mediation agreements.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target Met

Baseline data (2004-2005) indicated 100% of mediations resulted in mediation agreements. The target was 80% of mediations would result in mediation agreements. 87.5% of requests for mediation resulted in mediation agreements. Eight (8) requests for mediation were filed during the year. Seven requests resulted in mediation agreements. One mediation is still in progress.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Recruit additional Mediators – Notice of December 2005 and February 2006 training sent to UPC, LEAs, DLC, Utah State Bar Assoc. and local dispute resolution groups.
2. Conduct training for Mediators, new and continuing.
 - Training completed December 2005 and February 2006.
3. Provide Mediators with updated information regarding procedures and requirements based on final IDEA implementing regulations
4. Provide Mediators with updated information regarding procedures and requirements based on new state rules.
 - Since the final Regulations were not issued by OSEP until August 2006, the prerequisite rules were not able to be developed in FFY 2005. Therefore, this Activity was not completed in FFY 2005.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- Successful dispute resolution programs including early informal resolution and facilitation projects may contribute to low overall requests for formal mediation. The data reported reflects a percentage of mediations that exceeds the target but falls short of the baseline data. Although baseline data of 100% of requests resulting in mediation agreements was obtained, we believe that expecting that level of agreement consistently would be impracticable and contrary to the spirit of the law.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06):

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Recruit additional Mediators as needed.	Ongoing	USOE staff, agency technology resources (including email), IDEA discretionary funds	The USOE currently has a list of seven (7) mediators. This number has been sufficient for the Compliance Officer to provide a mediator upon request in generally less than one week and upon occasion by the next day. There are two (2) goals to be accomplished: 1) the ability to provide a skilled mediator within a reasonable time frame and 2) provide the pool of mediators with enough opportunities to serve that they keep their skills and are motivated to attend the training necessary to maintain eligibility.
2. Conduct trainings for Mediators, new and continuing.	January 2008	Compliance Officer, IDEA funds, consultant attorney, listserve dialogue	All mediators will be provided with updated information regarding procedures and requirements based on final IDEA regulations and new state rules.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-06)	One hundred (100) percent of 618 reports, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports will be accurate and submitted on time

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target met.

Baseline data (2004-2005): 100%. Target was 100%. Current data (2005-2006):100%.

All 618 data reports required of OSEP were completed and submitted on time. Child Count, FAPE and Assessment were submitted on February 1, 2006. Exit, Discipline and Personnel reports were submitted by November 1, 2006. Our State Performance Plan was submitted on time and modifications and suggestions for improvements and additional data required by OSEP were on time as per instructions.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2005:

1. Implement unique student identification number system to more accurately match, track, and interpret data. Completed.
 - A unique student identification number system is now in place in Utah, allowing for more accurate data collection.
2. Inform LEAs of all new data collection elements based on new 618 reports and SPP, and procedures for collection and submission of the data. Completed (and ongoing).
 - All LEAs are aware of the new data collection elements and how to collect and submit these data.
3. Train LEA data managers and special education directors on new data collection procedures and timeliness. Completed (and ongoing).
 - All LEA data managers and special education directors were trained and are aware of the new data collection procedures and timeliness.
4. Collaborate and communicate with USOE personnel regarding data needs. Completed (and ongoing).
 - Interdepartmental meetings have been held and the technology and data staff members at the USOE are very aware of our immediate and future data needs.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Progress:

- In order to maintain 100% compliance with this indicator, the State has implemented the following procedures:
 - Each LEA is provided a data profile of all data indicators contained in the SPP and APR comparing their data with state and national averages.
 - Training is provided to all new Special Education Directors and LEA Data Managers on data collection and obligations for 618 data.
 - Public access to 618 data is provided through the public reporting process.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005 (2005-06)

Activity	Timeline	Resources	Justification
1. Utilize 618 data profiles and UPIPS data in decision making and professional development activities.	2006 (and ongoing)	USOE Staff, UPDC Staff, IDEA discretionary funds	To ensure utilization of data in the decision making and professional development processes in order to improve results for students.

APPENDIX A

ACRONYMS

APR	Annual Performance Report
AUT	Autism
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
BTOTS	Baby and Toddler Tracking System
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CD	Communication Disorder
CMAC	Coalition of Minorities Advisory Committee
COSF	Child Outcome Summary Form
DIBELS	Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
DLC	Disability Law Center
DPHO	Due Process Hearing Officer
EDEN	Education Data Exchange Network
ECO	Early Childhood Outcome Center
ED	Emotional Disturbance
EIRI	Early Intervention Research Institute
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FBA	Functional Behavioral Assessment
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
GED	General Educational Development
ID	Intellectual Disability
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual Education Program
LDAU	Learning Disabilities Association of Utah
LEA	Local Education Agency
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MCA	Multiple Classification Analysis
MPRRC	Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center
NCLB	No Child Left Behind
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring center
NECTAC	National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
NSTTAC	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Centers
OHI	Other Health Impairment
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
P&A	Protection and Advocacy
PBS	Positive Behavior Supports
PIP	Program Improvement Plan
PSU	Primary Sampling Units
PTI	Parent Training and Information
RFP	Request for Proposal
RISEP	Research Institute for Safe and Effective Programs
RtI	Response to Intervention
SEA	State Education Agency

SET	School-wide Evaluation Tool
SIS	Student Information System
SLD	Specific Learning Disabilities
SPP	State Performance Plan
SRR	Student Record Review
SSID	Statewide Student Identifier
SWAT	Statewide Assistance Team
SWD	Student with Disabilities
UBCST	Utah Basic Competency Skills Test
UBI	Utah's Behavior Initiatives
UBIDA	Utah Branch of the International Dyslexia Association
UPASS	Utah Performance Assessment System for Students
UPC	Utah Parent Center
UPDC	Utah Personnel Development Center
UPIPS	Utah Program Improving Planning System
UPOD	Utah Preschool Outcomes Data
USEAP	Utah Special Education Advisory Panel
USOE	Utah State Office of Education
USU	Utah State University
WIA	Workforce Investment Act

APPENDIX B

Parent Survey—Special Education

This is a survey for parents of students receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. For each statement below, please circle either yes (Y), no (N) or not applicable (NA) when available.

Procedural Safeguards

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Did you receive a copy of your procedural safeguards (parent's rights)? | Y | N |
| 2. Were your procedural safeguards (parent's rights) explained so that you understood them? | Y | N |
| 3. If you speak a language other than English, does the school communicate with you in that language? | Y | N |

Evaluation and Eligibility

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Did you sign a consent form before your child was evaluated? | Y | N |
| 5. Did you have the opportunity to provide input during your child's evaluation? | Y | N |
| 6. Did the evaluation team listen to and consider your input? | Y | N |
| 7. Were you invited to a meeting to discuss the results of your child's evaluation? | Y | N |

IEP Development

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. Was the IEP meeting scheduled at a mutually agreeable time? | Y | N |
| 9. Did you receive notice of the time and place before each IEP meeting? | Y | N |
| 10. Were you informed of your right to invite individuals who have knowledge or special expertise about your child to the IEP meeting? | Y | N |
| 11. Did you bring someone to the IEP meeting? | Y | N |
| 12. Did your child's regular education teacher attend the IEP meeting? | Y | N |
| 13. Did the principal or another LEA representative attend the IEP meeting? | Y | N |
| 14. Did you feel the team asked for and used your input on goals and objectives for your child's IEP? | Y | N |
| 15. Do you feel all of your child's needs were addressed during the IEP meeting? | Y | N |
| 16. At your child's IEP meeting, did the team discuss how your child would participate in statewide and district-wide testing (U-PASS)? | Y | N |
| 17. At your child's IEP meeting, did the IEP team discuss classroom accommodations and modifications your child needs? | Y | N |
| 18. Did you sign a consent form before your child was placed in special education? | Y | N |

IEP Implementation

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 19. Are your child's regular education teachers aware of your child's learning needs? | Y | N |
| 20. Does the staff in the regular classroom consistently provide the accommodations and modifications written in your child's IEP? | Y | N |

- 21. Do your child's regular education and special education teachers work together to implement the IEP? Y N
- 22. Is your child getting all of the services listed on the IEP? Y N
- 23. Are the related services your child receives (i.e., speech therapy, occupational therapy, counseling) helping him/her to benefit from special education services? Y N
- 24. Does your child participate in school activities such as assemblies, after school activities and field trips with non-disabled students? Y N
- 25. Is your child making progress toward meeting the goals on his/her IEP? Y N
- 26. Do you receive periodic reports on your child's progress toward IEP goals? Y N

Transition

- 27. If your child is 15 years old or older, did the IEP team discuss transition services (e.g., career interests, employment, high school classes) during an IEP meeting? Y N NA
- 28. Does your child's IEP provide the direction and plan for helping your child reach his/her long term goals after he/she leaves public school? Y N NA

Discipline

- 29. Has your child been removed from his/her special education program as a result of a disciplinary action this school year (suspended or expelled)? Y N
- 30. Did he/she receive special education services in a different setting during that time? Y N NA

General

- 31. Does the school empower you to have a positive effect on the quality of your child's program? Y N
- 32. Does the school facilitate opportunities for you to provide input about your child's education other than at IEP meetings? Y N
- 33. Is there a school-home communication system in place that provides you the opportunity to exchange important information about your student as often as necessary? Y N
- 34. Does your school facilitate your involvement as a means of improving services and results for your child with disabilities? Y N
- 35. Were you ever given information about organizations that offer support for parents with students with disabilities by your school/district? Y N
- 36. Have you participated in any training offered by the district, school, or the Utah Parent Center? Y N

APPENDIX C

UTAH POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES SURVEY

April to September 2007

1. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This information is provided by the Utah DOE and will be available for surveyors prior to beginning the interviews.

1a. Student's name _____

1b. Student's date of birth: Month: _____ Day: _____ Year: _____

1c. Student's special education disability (*check only one option*)

- _____ Specific Learning Disability
- _____ Intellectual Disability
- _____ Communication Disorder
- _____ Emotional Disturbance
- _____ Hearing Impairment/Deafness
- _____ Visual Impairment
- _____ Deaf/blindness
- _____ Orthopedic Impairment
- _____ Multiple Disabilities
- _____ Other Health Impairment
- _____ Autism
- _____ Traumatic Brain Injury

1d. Gender

- _____ Female
- _____ Male

1e. Ethnicity (*check only one option that best represents the student*)

- _____ White,
- _____ Black,
- _____ Hispanic
- _____ American Indian
- _____ Asian
- _____ Pacific Islander
- _____ Unknown

1f. Manner in which student exited school (*check only one option, based on USOE exit code*) Verify with student.

- _____ Graduated with a regular diploma
- _____ Reached maximum age
- _____ Dropped-out

1g. LEA last attended _____

DATA FOR ALL SECTIONS SHOULD BE GATHERED ON EACH STUDENT IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THEIR EXIT FROM HIGH SCHOOL.

INTRODUCTION/ASK FOR PARTICIPATION: (If student is under 18 or unable to talk on the phone, due to type or severity of disability, ask to speak to parent/guardian)

“Hello. My name is _____. May I speak with (student)? I am calling from _____ for the Utah State Office of Education.

“We are doing a survey of students who were served in special education and left school during the 2005-06 school year to see how they are doing. The information you provide will benefit future students by helping to improve services for them.

“The survey should take about 5 minutes. Your participation is voluntary and all information will be kept confidential. No personal information will be reported to anyone. **Would you mind answering a few questions?”**

If no, thank student/family and indicate “refused” below.

(1) **Yes (Go to Q. 2)**

No (INDICATE THE REASON THE INTERVIEW WAS NOT COMPLETED):

- ____ Unable to locate correct phone number
- ____ Three attempts were made without contact
- ____ Refused to participate
- ____ Student has moved and cannot be contacted
- ____ Student has died
- ____ Student is in jail or prison
- ____ Other _____ (fill-in from drop box)

Thank person on the phone. Continue with next interview.

EMPLOYMENT

“I’d like to first ask you some questions about your employment since leaving high school”

(2) **3a. Since leaving high school, have you been EMPLOYED AT ANY TIME?** (Check only one option)

- ____ YES (Go to Q. 4)
- ____ NO (Go to Q. 3)
- ____ Refused to answer (Go to Q. 4)
- ____ Don’t know (Go to Q. 4)

(3) **3b. Why have you NOT been employed?** (Check each option that applies)

- ____ Lack of employment opportunities in the immediate locale (Go to Q. 5)
- ____ Student lacks necessary employment skills (Go to Q. 5)
- ____ Student lacks transportation (Go to Q. 5)
- ____ Student has not received necessary services from community agencies (e.g., VR) (Go to Q.

5)

- ____ Student is enrolled in school (Go to Q. 5)
- ____ Student has family obligations (Go to Q. 5)

- Student does not want to work (*Go to Q. 5*)
- Student would lose benefits (e.g., SSI/disability/unemployment) (*Go to Q. 5*)
- Student has health issues that preclude working (*Go to Q. 5*)
- Other (*please describe briefly*): _____ (*fill-in from drop box*)
(*Go to Q. 5*)
- Refused (*Go to Q. 5*)
- Don't Know (*Go to Q. 5*)

(4) 3c. Are you working currently? (*Check only one option*)

- YES
- NO (*Go to Q. 11*)
- Refused to answer
- Don't know

ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR THE CURRENT JOB (IF CURRENTLY WORKING) OR IF NOT CURRENTLY WORKING, FOR THE JOB THAT WAS HELD FOR THE LONGEST TIME SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL

(5) 3d. Is/was the work (*Check only one option*)

- In a integrated employment setting for pay
- In a integrated employment setting as a volunteer or in a training capacity
- In a sheltered employment setting that is only for workers with disabilities
- In a supported employment program in a community or integrated work setting
- In own or family member's home (e.g. homemaker)
- In the military
- Other (*please describe briefly*): _____ (*fill-in from drop box*)
- Refused to answer
- Don't Know

(6) 3e. How many hours do you typically work per week? (*Check only one option*)

- 35 or more hours per week
- Less than 35 hours per week
- Refused
- Don't Know

(7) 3f. What is/was your typical hourly wage? (*Check only one option*)

- Less than minimum wage
- Minimum wage (UT \$5.15/hour)
- More than Minimum wage
- Refused
- Don't Know

(8) 3h. Does/did your job provide benefits (*Check only one option*)

- YES
- NO
- Refused
- Don't Know

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

“Next I’d like to ask you some questions about your participation in any schooling since leaving high school:

(9) 4a. Since leaving high school, have you been enrolled in any postsecondary education or training program at any time? (Check only one option)

- YES (Go to Q. 13)
- NO (Go to Q. 12)
- Refused to answer
- Don’t know

(10) 4b. Why have you not enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program? (Check each option that applies)

- Lack of postsecondary opportunities in the immediate locale
- Student lacks necessary skills/qualifications to enter postsecondary education
- Student lacks transportation
- Student has not received necessary services from community agencies (e.g., VR)
- Student is working
- Student has family obligations that preclude going to postsecondary education
- Student does not want to go to postsecondary education / did not plan to go
- Graduated/completed certificate/finished the classes wanted/needed to take
- Student has health problems that preclude going to postsecondary education
- Other (please describe briefly): _____ (fill-in from drop box)
- Refused
- Don’t Know

(11) 4c. Are you currently enrolled in any postsecondary education or training program at this point in time? (Check only one option)

- YES
- NO (Go to Q. 16)
- Refused to answer
- Don’t know

ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR THE CURRENT POST-SECONDARY ENROLLMENT; OR IF NOT CURRENTLY ENROLLED, ASK FOR THE POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN WHICH HE/SHE WAS ENROLLED FOR THE LONGEST POINT IN TIME SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL

(12) 4d. Is/was your postsecondary program a (Check only one option):

- Community College or other 2-year college
- College/University (4-year college)
- Vocational/Technical School
- Short-term education or employment training program such as WIA, Job Corps, etc.
- High school completion program, such as Adult Education or G.E.D. program
- Church mission or other humanitarian mission
- Other (please describe briefly): _____ (fill-in from drop box)
- Refused to answer
- Don’t know

(13) 4e. Are/were you enrolled (Check only one option):

- Full-time (12 credits or more or at minimum 12 hours in attendance each week)
- Part-time (less than 12 credits or less than 12 hours in attendance each week.)
- Refused to answer
- Don't know

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

“Next I'd like to ask you some questions about where you are living and any community services that you may be receiving.”

(14) 5a. Which of these best describes your current living arrangement? (Check only one option):

- With a parent
- With another family member (e.g. aunt/uncle, cousin, brother/sister)
- With a spouse or roommate in a home or apartment, college dorm, sorority or fraternity housing
- Alone
- Military Housing / Barracks
- Institutional residence (e.g. medical, correctional, convalescent, mental health)
- Supervised living residence (e.g. assisted living center, group home, adult foster care)
- Other (please describe briefly): _____ (fill-in from drop box)
- Don't Know/Refused

AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

“Finally, I'd like to ask you some questions about the assistance you have received since leaving High School..”

(15) 6a. Since leaving high school, have you received services or assistance or talked with anyone from any of the following agencies? (Check each option that applies)

- Rehabilitation Services for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Rehabilitation Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Vocational Rehabilitation (VR)
- Division of Services for Persons with Disabilities (DSPD)
- Division of Work Force Services (DWS)
- Social Security Administration
- College or university student assistance center
- Disability Law Center
- Other (please describe briefly): _____ (fill-in from drop box)

(16) What difficulties, if any, have you had being employed or attending post secondary school as you would like? (Record comments)

(17) Thinking about the things you are doing now, what is something positive that happened while you were in high school to help you reach your goals? (Record comments)

“Thank you for your help today.”

APPENDIX D

Table 7

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B. of the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
2006-07

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	9
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	9
(a) Reports with findings	2
(b) Reports within timeline	7
(c) Reports within extended timelines	2
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	N/A
Section B: Mediation Requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	8
(2.1) Mediations	7
(a) Mediations related to due process	0
(1) Mediation agreements	N/A
(b) Mediations not related to due process	8
(1) Mediation agreements	7
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	1
Section C. Hearing Requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	4
(3.1) Resolution sessions	4
(a) Settlement Agreements	4
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Decisions within timeline	N/A
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	N/A
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	4
Section D: Expedited Hearing Requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	N/A
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	N/A
(a) Change of placement ordered	N/A

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	5827	39589
4	5716	38606
5	5294	38306
6	4851	37273
7	3975	36376
8	3636	36619
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:) 10	2589	23919

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	SUBSET (OF 3) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (3B)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	5467	2675	4	9
4	5358	2821	1	7
5	4953	2791	6	7
6	4524	2760	4	4
7	3620	1528	5	8
8	3270	1254	4	7
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	2277	215	1	9

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK OUT OF GRADE LEVEL ASSESSMENT		
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4B)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (5)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (5A)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (5B)	SUBSET (OF 5B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB CAP ³ (5C)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ⁴ (5D)
3	348	0	348	0	0
4	347	0	347	0	0
5	324	0	324	0	0
6	313	0	313	0	0
7	332	0	332	0	0
8	333	0	333	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	245	0	245	0	0

³ NCLB cap is the limit on the percent of students whose scores can be held to alternate achievement standards in AYP calculations.

⁴ Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
	PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	5	7
4	0	6	5
5	0	6	11
6	0	9	5
7	0	19	4
8	0	27	6
HIGH SCHOOL :	10	53	14

⁵ Provide a list of other reasons for exemption with the number of students exempted by each grade and reason for exemption.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

2005-2006

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Minimal	Partial	Sufficient	Substantial						9A ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level								
3	Criterion Referenced Test	1369	1369	1104	1616	0	0	0	0	0	5458
4	Criterion Referenced Test	1396	1368	819	1768	0	0	0	0	0	5351
5	Criterion Referenced Test	1494	1343	875	1234	0	0	0	0	0	4946
6	Criterion Referenced Test	1356	1494	768	902	0	0	0	0	0	4520
7	Criterion Referenced Test	1260	781	636	935	0	0	0	0	0	3612
8	Criterion Referenced Test	1673	573	611	406	0	0	0	0	0	3263
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	Criterion Referenced Test	1221	486	439	122	0	0	0	0	0	2268

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Sufficient

¹ Include all students whose regular assessment score was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score (column 3B).

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3C.

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	9B ROW TOTAL ²							
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ Include all students whose score on the alternate assessment on grade level standards was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is to equal the number reported in column 5A minus that portion of 5F that includes students whose assessment scored on grade level standards was invalid.

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Minimal	Partial	Sufficient	Substantial						9C ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level								
3	Utah's Alternate Assessr	26	32	67	223	0	0	0	0	0	348
4	Utah's Alternate Assessr	40	24	54	229	0	0	0	0	0	347
5	Utah's Alternate Assessr	36	20	45	223	0	0	0	0	0	324
6	Utah's Alternate Assessr	31	45	48	189	0	0	0	0	0	313
7	Utah's Alternate Assessr	33	35	59	205	0	0	0	0	0	332
8	Utah's Alternate Assessr	34	32	57	210	0	0	0	0	0	333
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	Utah's Alternate Assessr	23	26	46	150	0	0	0	0	0	245

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Sufficient

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score. If your state has an approved exception to the 1% cap, as indicated in Section A, use your adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be the lowest achievement level.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9D is to equal the number reported in column 4 plus the number reported in column 5D minus the number reported in columns 4B and that portion of 5F that includes students whose alternate assessment scored on alternate standard was invalid.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 6) ¹	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 7)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 8)	NO VALID SCORE ⁷ (10)	TOTAL ⁸ (11)
3	5458	0	348	21	5827
4	5351	0	347	18	5716
5	4946	0	324	24	5294
6	4520	0	313	18	4851
7	3612	0	332	31	3975
8	3263	0	333	40	3636
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	2268	0	245	76	2589

⁷ The number of students reported in column 10 is to equal the number reported in column 3C plus column 4B plus column 5D plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

⁸ The number of students reported in column 11, the row total, should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in Section A.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL		STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3		5846	39589
4		5729	38603
5		5309	38302
6		4858	37277
7		4198	36986
8		3975	37678
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	10	3273	35925

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	SUBSET (OF 3) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (3B)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	5480	2727	10	9
4	5363	2790	14	9
5	4965	2756	23	0
6	4535	2671	9	3
7	3838	1574	11	6
8	3617	1242	10	14
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	2936	755	1	16

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK OUT OF GRADE LEVEL ASSESSMENT		
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4B)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (5)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (5A)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (5B)	SUBSET (OF 5B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB CAP ³ (5C)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ⁴ (5D)
3	357	0	357	0	0
4	352	0	352	0	0
5	327	0	327	0	0
6	317	0	317	0	0
7	340	0	340	0	0
8	333	0	333	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	253	0	253	0	0

³ NCLB cap is the limit on the percent of students whose scores can be held to alternate achievement standards in AYP calculations.

⁴ Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
	PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	2	7
4	0	8	6
5	0	6	11
6	0	4	2
7	0	16	4
8	0	18	7
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	76	8

⁵ Provide a list of other reasons for exemption with the number of students exempted by each grade and reason for exemption.

2005-2006

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Minimal	Partial	Sufficient	Substantial						9A ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level								
3	Criterion Referenced Test	1510	1455	1321	1185	0	0	0	0	0	5471
4	Criterion Referenced Test	1499	1281	1422	1152	0	0	0	0	0	5354
5	Criterion Referenced Test	1603	1382	1315	665	0	0	0	0	0	4965
6	Criterion Referenced Test	1537	1315	1111	569	0	0	0	0	0	4532
7	Criterion Referenced Test	1587	890	956	399	0	0	0	0	0	3832
8	Criterion Referenced Test	1638	824	799	342	0	0	0	0	0	3603
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	Criterion Referenced Test	1340	693	681	206	0	0	0	0	0	2920

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Sufficient

¹ Include all students whose regular assessment score was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score (column 3B).

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3C.

2005-2006

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	9B ROW TOTAL ²							
		3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ Include all students whose score on the alternate assessment on grade level standards was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is to equal the number reported in column 5A minus that portion of 5F that includes students whose assessment scored on grade level standards was invalid.

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Minimal	Partial	Sufficient	Substantial						9C ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level								
3	Utah's Alternate Assessr	23	19	56	259	0	0	0	0	0	357
4	Utah's Alternate Assessr	24	21	53	254	0	0	0	0	0	352
5	Utah's Alternate Assessr	20	24	54	229	0	0	0	0	0	327
6	Utah's Alternate Assessr	28	15	64	210	0	0	0	0	0	317
7	Utah's Alternate Assessr	21	26	72	221	0	0	0	0	0	340
8	Utah's Alternate Assessr	25	31	53	224	0	0	0	0	0	333
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	Utah's Alternate Assessr	22	28	48	155	0	0	0	0	0	253

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Sufficient

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score.
 If your state has an approved exception to the 1% cap, as indicated in Section A, use your adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be the lowest achievement level.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9D is to equal the number reported in column 4 plus the number reported in column 5D minus the number reported in columns 4B and that portion of 5F that includes students whose alternate assessment scored on alternate standard was invalid.

2005-2006

STATE: UT - UTAH

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 15)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 16)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 17)	NO VALID SCORE ⁷ (10)	TOTAL ⁸ (11)
3	5471	0	357	18	5846
4	5354	0	352	23	5729
5	4965	0	327	17	5309
6	4532	0	317	9	4858
7	3832	0	340	26	4198
8	3603	0	333	39	3975
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	2920	0	253	100	3273

⁷ The number of students reported in column 10 is to equal the number reported in column 3C plus column 4B plus column 5D plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

⁸ The number of students reported in column 11, the row total, should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in Section A.

Please explain the difference between column 11 and the number reported in column 1, Section A.

