State of Utah

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004

Annual Performance Report

FFY 2010
(2010-2011)

Prepared by the
Utah State Office of Education
February 1, 2012

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. Percent of the LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum n size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

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

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

Measurement:

A. AYP percent = [(# of LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum n size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum n size)] times 100.

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

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2010 (Data Year 2010-2011)	A. The percent of LEAs that made AYP in the students with disabilities subgroup will increase to 78% by 2010-11. B. The percent of students with disabilities participating in Statewide assessments in language arts will increase to 95% by 2010-2011. The percent of students with disabilities participating in Statewide assessments in math will increase to 95% by 2010-2011. C. The percent of grade 3-8 students and for grade 10 students who are proficient in language arts assessments will be 83%* and 82%*, respectively. The percent of grade 3-8 students and for grade 10 students who are proficient in mathematics assessments will be 45%* and 40%*, respectively. *Utah postponed the scheduled AYP targets increase for 2010-2011 for one year with approval from the U.S. Department of Education. The increase will occur in 2011-2012.

Display 3-1: Actual Data for FFY 2010:

Indicator	Topic	Target	Actual Data	Met or Not Met
3A.	**AYP**	78%	81.37%	Met
3B.	**Participation: Math**	95%	99.42%	Met
3B.	**Participation: Language Arts**	95%	99.56%	Met
3C.	**Proficiency: Math 3-8**	45%	46.43%	Met
3C.	**Proficiency: Math 10**	40%	25.67%	Not Met
3C.	**Proficiency: Language Arts 3-8**	83%	51.00%	Not Met
3C.	**Proficiency: Language Arts 10**	82%	53.58%	Not Met

Indicator Summary: Four of the seven targets for this indicator were met.

Reporting of Targets and Actual Data:

3A. Actual AYP Data for FFY 2010: 81.37%

Display 3-2: Number and Percent of LEAs That Met the State's AYP Target for the Disability Subgroup (Based on Those LEAs that Met the Minimum n Size for the Disability Subgroup):

FFY	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs Meeting the n Size	Number of LEAs that Meet the Minimum n* Size and Met AYP for FFY 2010	Percent of LEAs That Met AYP
2010 (2010-2011)	119	102	83	83/102 = 81.37%

*Minimum n size for participation is n≥40 and the n size for proficiency or performance is n≥10.

The target of 78% was met.

3B. Actual Participation Data for FFY 2010:

Display 3-3: Participation Rate of Students with Disabilities

(FAY* and non-FAY included)	**Math**	**Language Arts**
a. Children with IEPs	38,116	40,090
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	11,106	12,170
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	23,486	24,437
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	3,304	3,308
Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative.	220	175
Overall = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)]	**99.42%**	**99.56%**

*Full Academic Year (FAY)

The target of 95% for Math was met.

The target of 95% for Language Arts was met.

3C. Actual Proficiency Rate for FFY 2010:

Display 3-4: Proficiency Rate of Students with Disabilities

(FAY included)	**Math 3-8**	**Math 10**	**Language Arts 3-8**	**Language Arts 10**
a. Children with IEPs	32,974	2,657	34,074	3,434
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,817	192	7,236	743
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,270	163	7,731	761
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2,222	327	2,412	336
Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)]	**46.43%**	**25.67%**	**51.00%**	**53.58%**

The target of 45% for grades 3-8 for Math was met.

The target of 40% for grade 10 for Math was not met.

The target of 83% for grades 3-8 for Language Arts was not met.

The target of 82% for grade 10 for Language Arts was not met.

3B. Actual Participation Data for FFY 2010:

Display 3-5: Disaggregated Data for Math Participation

Statewide Assessment FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011) (FAY and non-FAY included)	**Math Assessment**								
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**Grade 10**	**Total**	
								#	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	6,860	6,977	6,589	6,173	4,889	3,737	2,891	38,116	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,690	2,306	1,754	1,350	1,085	801	1,120	11,106	29.14%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,659	4,175	4,277	4,325	3,308	2,432	1,310	23,486	61.62%
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	492	477	532	469	468	461	405	3,304	8.67 %
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	6,841	6,958	6,563	6,144	4,861	3,694	2,835	37,896	99.42%
Children included in “a” but not included in the other counts above.									
Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative	19	19	26	29	28	43	56	220	0.58 %
Participation Rate by Grade Level	99.72%	99.73%	99.61%	99.53%	99.43%	98.85%	98.06%	99.42%	

Display 3-6: Disaggregated Data for Reading Participation

Statewide Assessment FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011) (FAY and non-FAY included)	**Language Arts Assessment**								
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**Grade 10**	**Total**	
								#	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	6,862	6,977	6,591	6,175	5,207	4,555	3,723	40,090	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,700	2,356	1,862	1,523	1,222	1,077	1,430	12,170	30.36 %
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,655	4,128	4,179	4,158	3,489	2,992	1,836	24,437	60.96%
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	492	477	532	469	468	462	408	3,308	8.25%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	6,847	6,961	6,573	6,150	5,179	4,531	3,674	39,915	99.56%
Children included in “a” but not included in the other counts above.									
Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative	15	16	18	25	28	24	49	175	0.44 %
Participation Rate by Grade Level	99.78%	99.77%	99.73%	99.60%	99.46%	99.47%	98.68%	99.56%	

3.C. Actual Performance Data for FFY 2010:

Display 3-7: Disaggregated Data for Math Performance: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs that Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011) (FAY included)	**Math Assessment Performance**						**Total**	
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	6,409	6,545	6,155	5,787	4,607	3,471	32,974	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,970	1,683	1,251	918	660	335	6,817	20.67%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,025	1,287	1,232	1,074	1,174	478	6,270	19.02%
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	357	369	405	367	354	370	2,222	6.74%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	3,352	3,339	2,888	2,359	2,188	1,183	15,309	46.43%
Proficiency Rate by Grade Level	52.30%	51.02%	46.92%	40.76%	47.49%	34.08%	46.43%	

Display 3-8: Disaggregated Target Data for Math Performance: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs that Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011) (FAY included)	**Math Assessment Performance**	**Total**	
	Grade 10	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	2,657	2,657	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	192	192	7.23%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	163	163	6.14%
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0%
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0%
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	327	327	12.31%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	682	682	25.67%

Display 3-9: Disaggregated Data for Language Arts Performance: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs that Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011) (FAY included)	**Language Arts Assessment Performance**						**Total**	
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	6,415	6,550	6,166	5,795	4,898	4,250	34,074	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,929	1,617	1,248	1,041	687	714	7,236	21.24%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,293	1,255	1,198	1,398	1,167	1,420	7,731	22.69%
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	393	399	442	395	387	396	2,412	7.08%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	3,615	3,271	2,888	2,834	2,241	2,530	17,379	51.00%
Proficiency Rate by Grade Level	56.35%	49.94%	46.84%	48.90%	45.75%	59.53%	51.00%	

Display 3-10: Disaggregated Data for Language Arts Performance: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs that Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011) (FAY included)	**Language Arts Assessment Performance**	**Total**	
	Grade 10	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	3,434	3,434	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	743	743	21.64%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	761	761	22.16%
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0%
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0%
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	336	336	9.79%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	1,840	1,840	53.58%

Valid and Reliable Data:

The accuracy of the data is ensured as they go through quality assurance and quality control established by both the assessment results team and the Information Technology (IT) section at the Utah State Office of Education.

Public Reporting Information:

The Special Education Assessment website, http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/Assessment.aspx has links to numerous documents including:

- The Utah Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy can be found at http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/DOCS/assessment/Special_Needs_Accommodations_Policy-pdf.aspx
- Indicator 3
- Utah's CRT and UAA Results for Schools
- Utah's CRT and UAA Results for LEAs

- Utah's CRT and UAA Results for the State
- The Statewide scores for the Direct Writing Assessment (DWA)
- The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) Assessment webpage
- The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) Public School Data Gateway http://schools.utah.gov

AYP reports may be accessed from the USOE Assessment Reports webpage at http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/Reports.aspx.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 (Data Year 2010-2011):

The number of LEAs that are meeting the minimum n size for this subgroup has increased over time, from 57 in 2004-2005 to 102 in 2010-2011. Minimum n size for participation is n≥40 and the n size for proficiency or performance is n≥10. Thus, maintaining or increasing the percent of LEAs that meet AYP for this subgroup is a challenge but one for which the State of Utah has put forth considerable effort.

Display 3-11: Trend Data for FFY 2008, FFY 2009, and FFY 2010

Indicator	Topic	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
3A. AYP	**Target**	66%	72%	78%
	Actual Data	94%	93%	81.37%
	Met or Not Met	Met	Met	Met
3B. Participation: Math	**Target**	95%	95%	95%
	Actual Data	99.51%	99.69%	99.42%
	Met or Not Met	Met	Met	Met
3B. Participation: Language Arts	**Target**	95%	95%	95%
	Actual Data	99.58%	99.66%	99.56%
	Met or Not Met	Met	Met	Met
3C. Proficiency: Math 3-8	**Target**	45%	45%	45%
	Actual Data	42.01%	45.95%	46.43%
	Met or Not Met	Not Met	Met	Met
3C. Proficiency: Math 10 (2010) Math 10-12 (2009-2008)	**Target**	40%	40%	40%
	Actual Data	39.54%	37.53%	25.67%
	Met or Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

3C. **Proficiency: Language Arts 3-8**	**Target**	83%	83%	83%
	Actual Data	48.19%	48.96%	51.00%
	Met or Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
3C. **Proficiency: Language Arts 10**	**Target**	82%	82%	82%
	Actual Data	45.58%	50.63%	53.58%
	Met or Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

The participation rate of students with disabilities has increased from 86% (math) and 92% (language arts) in 2004-2005 to over 99% since 2008-2009. The increased participation rate is partially due to professional development provided on the Utah Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy and the number of educators who have been trained over the past years who implement the policy. The policy and professional development include a description of the assessments in Utah, acceptable and appropriate accommodations, who takes which assessment, and why students with disabilities must participate. Since this professional development is designed for teachers of students with disabilities, it facilitates a better understanding of assessment requirements and practices. The USOE will continue to provide professional development opportunities for Special Education Directors, Assessment Directors, and LEA general and special education staff members on the Utah Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy.

Since FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on the Language Arts test has increased from 48% to 51% for students in grades 3-8 and from 46% to 54% for students in grade 10. This increase has not resulted in meeting the targets, but the gap is being reduced.

In FFY 2008, the Mathematics (Elementary and Secondary) core curriculum was significantly revised, resulting in new Mathematics assessments which were more rigorous than in years past. The performance (proficiency level) cut scores on the Mathematics assessments changed, which make direct comparisons between FFY 2007 and subsequent years problematic. The AYP calculation method in Utah for secondary math was changed in 2010-2011 from all math grades 10-12 to 10th grade Algebra 1. In FFY 2009, 3,585 students with disabilities participated in math grades10-12 or 99.06%, this percentage decreased to 2,835 students or 98.06% in FFY 2010.

Math performance for students in 10th grade Algebra 1 may have decreased due to lack of prior experience in Algebra 1 content to enable students to be proficient in Algebra 1 by the end of 10th grade. Prior to Spring 2011, LEAs were notified of the change in AYP secondary math calculation and the focus intensified on improving instruction for students in general and special education. During 2010-2011, professional development in mathematics progress monitoring was provided along with a pilot math content teacher education program, Project KNOTtT, which helped 22 out of 23 educators pass the mathematics PRAXIS.

The USOE has held numerous professional development opportunities in the areas of literacy and numeracy in collaboration with the Title I and Teaching and Learning Sections. General education and special education teachers attended. The data are beginning to reflect those efforts with an increase in Language Arts proficiency for FFY 2009 which continued in FFY 2010. Proficiency in math grades 3-8 continued to improve in FFY 2010.

Data for 3B included both Full Academic Year (FAY) and non-FAY data and data for 3C are based on FAY (i.e., AYP) data. The calculations in 3B include all students with IEPs, in all grades assessed,

including students not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year (FAY). The calculations in 3C include all students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year.

The target for 3A was set in the FFY 2005 SPP; Utah's AYP process does not have a 3A-related target. The targets for 3B and 3C are aligned with the AYP targets established in Utah's Consolidated Accountability Workbook, and thus represent a change from the targets established in the FFY 2005 SPP. The targets are available at http://www.schools.utah.gov/data/Educational-Data/Accountability-School-Performance/AYP_Decision_Tree.aspx.

Each improvement activity was reviewed in terms of its impact on Indicator 3. Improvement activities resulted in the development of resources and implementation of targeted professional development activities, which in turn increased LEA knowledge and available resource materials, thus ensuring appropriate accommodations of students with disabilities as indicated by UPIPS monitoring data. Policies, procedures, and practices have been appropriately aligned to ESEA requirements. This alignment is expected to continue to facilitate the increase in participation and proficiency of students with disabilities on Statewide assessments.

1. Collaboratively provide Statewide professional development on ELA (literacy and reading) instruction and interventions for general and special educators. Completed and ongoing.
   - Short-term results: Provided professional development to 4,300 educators in the ELA Common Core Curriculum.
   - Medium-term results: Continued to provide support to LEAs in the ELA Common Core Curriculum.
   - Long-term results: Changes in policies and practices will ultimately improve student outcomes and assessment data on Criterion-Referenced Tests at both the State and LEA levels.

2. Collaboratively provide Statewide professional development on mathematics (numeracy) instruction and interventions for general and special educators.
   - Short-term results: Provided professional development to 400 special educators in mathematics progress monitoring and 22 out of 23 secondary special educators passed the mathematics PRAXIS who participated in the Project KNOTtT pilot.
   - Medium-term results: Continued to provide professional development in Standards-Based IEPs, mathematics progress monitoring and Project KNOTtT.
   - Long-term results: Changes in policies and practices will ultimately improve student outcomes and assessment data on Criterion-Referenced Tests at both the State and LEA levels.

3. Provide professional development Statewide on the Extended Core Standards. Completed and ongoing.
   - Short-term results: Provided professional development to 174 special educators who instruct students with significant cognitive disabilities to achieve awareness and knowledge of the Extended Core Standards.
   - Medium-term results: Continued to provide professional development, support and encouragement to LEAs to instruct students with significant cognitive disabilities in the Extended Core Standards.
   - Long-term results: Changes in policies and practices will ultimately improve student outcomes and assessment data on Utah's Alternate Assessment at both the State and LEA levels.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance in Related Requirements (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	10
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	10

3. Number of FFY 2009 findings not verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	0

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (Same as the number (3) from above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2011:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Justifications
NEW ACTIVITY #1 Increase secondary teachers' content knowledge via Project KNOTtT.	2011 and ongoing	UPDC staff, USOE staff, IDEA statewide Activity funds	Project KNOTtT will increase secondary teachers' math content knowledge.
NEW ACTIVITY #2 Improve teachers' ability to adjust instruction for individual students with Mathematics Progress Monitoring.	2011 and ongoing	UPDC staff, USOE staff, IDEA statewide Activity funds	Mathematics progress monitoring will improve teachers' ability to adjust instruction for individual students.
NEW ACTIVITY #3 Increase access to the Common Core in ELA and Mathematics and link specialized instruction to the Common Core through Standards-Based IEPs.	2011 and ongoing	UPDC staff, USOE staff, IDEA statewide Activity funds	Increase access to the Common Core in ELA and math and link specialized instruction to the Common Core.
NEW ACTIVITY #4 Improve mathematic content instruction and knowledge for pre-service teachers by IHEs.	2011 and ongoing	IHEs, USOE	Increase math content instruction and knowledge for pre-service special education teachers by IHEs.