State of Utah

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004

Annual Performance Report

Indicator 3

FFY 2011
(2011-2012)

Prepared by the
Utah State Office of Education
February 4, 2013

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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 AMO 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. AMO percent = [(# of LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of LEAs that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100. These are the AMO data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA as a result of ESEA flexibility.

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

C. Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and Mathematics)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year (FAY) and those not enrolled for a full academic year (non FAY).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2011 (Data Year 2011-2012)	A. The percent of LEAs that made Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) targets in the students with disabilities subgroup will increase to: 54.23%* for grades 3-8 Mathematics assessments, 36.62%* for grade 10 Mathematics assessments, 58.20%* for grades 3-8 English Language Arts assessments, and to 59.47%* for grade 10 English Language Arts assessments. B. The percent of students with disabilities participating in Statewide assessments in Mathematics will increase to 95% by 2011-2012. The percent of students with disabilities participating in Statewide assessments in English Language Arts will increase to 95% by 2011-2012. C. The percent of grades 3-8 students and for grade 10 students who are proficient in Mathematics assessments will be 54.23%* and 36.62%*, respectively. The percent of grades 3-8 students and for grade 10 students who are proficient in English Language Arts assessments will be 58.20%* and 59.47%*, respectively.

	***In July 2012 Utah's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility was approved. Utah no longer makes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations. AMO targets have been reset and a six year trajectory has been established beginning in FFY 2011 as per Utah's approved ESEA waiver.**

Display 3-1: Actual Data for FFY 2011:

Indicator	Topic	Target	Actual Data	Met or Not Met
3A.	**AMO: Mathematics Grades 3-8**	54.23%	42.71%	Not Met
3A.	**AMO: Mathematics Grade 10**	36.62%	29.41%	Not Met
3A.	**AMO: English Language Arts Grades 3-8**	58.20%	52.08%	Not Met
3A.	**AMO: English Language Arts Grade 10**	59.47%	56.76%	Not Met
3B.	**Participation: Mathematics**	95.00%	99.12%	Met
3B.	**Participation: English Language Arts**	95.00%	99.49%	Met
3C.	**Proficiency: Mathematics Grades 3-8**	54.23%	45.79%	Not Met
3C.	**Proficiency: Mathematics Grade 10**	36.62%	26.05%	Not Met
3C.	**Proficiency: English Language Arts Grades 3-8**	58.20%	52.07%	Not Met
3C.	**Proficiency: English Language Arts Grade 10**	59.47%	54.39%	Not Met

Indicator Summary: Two of the 10 targets for this indicator were met.

Reporting of Targets and Actual Data:

3A. Actual AMO Data for FFY 2011:

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

FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012)	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs Meeting the "n" Size	Number of LEAs that Meet the Minimum "n"* Size and Met AMO for FFY 2011	Percent of LEAs That Met AMO
Mathematics Grades 3-8	120	96	41	42.71%
Mathematics Grade 10	120	34	10	29.41%
English Language Arts Grades 3-8	120	96	50	52.08%
English Language Arts Grade 10	120	37	21	56.76%

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

The target of 54.23% for grades 3-8 for Mathematics was not met.

The target of 36.62% for grade 10 for Mathematics was not met.

The target of 58.20% for grades 3-8 for English Language Arts was not met.

The target of 59.47% for grade 10 for English Language Arts was not met.
3B. Actual Participation Data for FFY 2011:

Display 3-3: Participation Rate of Students with Disabilities

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY* and non-FAY data included)	**Mathematics**	**English Language Arts**
a. Children with IEPs	40,362	41,509
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	11,581	12,362
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	25,042	25,495
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	3,385	3,441
Account for any children with IEPs who were not participants in the narrative.	354	211
Overall = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)]	**99.12%**	**99.49%**

The target of 95% for Mathematics was met.

The target of 95% for English Language Arts was met.

3C. Actual Proficiency Rate for FFY 2011:

Display 3-4: Proficiency Rate of Students with Disabilities

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data included)	**Mathematics Grades 3-8**	**Mathematics Grade 10**	**English Language Arts Grades 3-8**	**English Language Arts Grade 10**
a. Children with IEPs	37,003	3,359	37,762	3,747
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7,459	245	8,130	689
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	7,066	297	8,896	983
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	2,419	333	2,638	366
Overall percent = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)]	**45.79%**	**26.05%**	**52.07%**	**54.39%**

The target of 54.23% for grades 3-8 for Mathematics was not met.

The target of 36.62% for grade 10 for Mathematics was not met.

The target of 58.20% for grades 3-8 for English Language Arts was not met.

The target of 59.47% for grade 10 for English Language Arts was not met.
3B. Actual Participation Data for FFY 2011:

Display 3-5: Disaggregated Data for Mathematics Participation

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data combined)	**Mathematics Assessment**								
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**Grade 10**	**Total**	
								#	%
a. Children with IEPs	7,067	7,076	6,792	6,447	5,061	4,560	3,359	40,362	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,760	2,297	1,801	1,462	1,204	1,063	994	11,581	28.69%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,783	4,242	4,471	4,342	3,364	2,995	1,845	25,042	62.04%
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	490	524	498	534	442	459	438	3,385	8.39%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) baseline	7,033	7,063	6,770	6,338	5,010	4,517	3,277	40,008	99.12%
Children included in “a” but not included in the other counts above.									
Account for any children with IEPs who were not participants in the narrative	34	13	22	109	51	43	82	354	0.88%
h. Participation rate by grade level	99.52%	99.82%	99.68%	98.31%	98.99%	99.06%	97.56%	99.12%	

Display 3-6: Disaggregated Data for English Language Arts Participation

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data combined)	**English Language Arts Assessment**								
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**Grade 10**	**Total**	
								#	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	7,123	7,077	6,789	6,377	5,407	4,989	3,747	41,509	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,793	2,357	1,912	1,637	1,327	1,181	1,155	12,362	29.78%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,749	4,180	4,359	4,188	3,603	3,322	2,094	25,495	61.42%
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	549	524	501	532	442	460	433	3,441	8.29%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) baseline	7,091	7,061	6,772	6,357	5,372	4,963	3,682	41,298	99.49%
Children included in “a” but not included in the other counts above.									
Account for any children with IEPs who were not participants in the narrative	32	16	17	20	35	26	65	211	0.51%
h. Participation rate by grade level	99.55%	99.77%	99.75%	99.69%	99.35%	99.48%	98.27%	99.49%	

3.C. Actual Performance Data for FFY 2011:

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

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data combined)	**Mathematics Assessment Performance**						**Total**	
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	7,067	7,076	6,792	6,447	5,061	4,560	37,003	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,107	1,814	1,359	967	778	434	7,459	20.16%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,137	1,433	1,458	1,177	1,216	645	7,066	19.10%
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	387	445	421	440	354	372	2,419	6.54%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) baseline	3,631	3,692	3,238	2,584	2,348	1,451	16,944	45.80%
h. Proficiency rate by grade level	51.38%	52.18%	47.67%	40.08%	46.39%	31.82%	45.79%	

Display 3-8: Disaggregated Data for Mathematics Performance Grades 3 – 8 by FAY and Non-FAY Combined and FAY Only

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012)	**Mathematics Assessment Performance**						**Total**
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**%**
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY and non-FAY combined)	51.38%	52.18%	47.67%	40.08%	46.39%	31.82%	45.79%
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY)	52.84%	53.43%	48.76%	41.11%	47.27%	32.72%	46.92%

Display 3-9: Disaggregated Target Data for Mathematics Performance Grade 10: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs who Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data combined)	**Mathematics Assessment Performance**	**Total**	
	Grade 10	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	3,359	3,359	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	245	245	7.29%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	297	297	8.84%
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	333	333	9.91%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) baseline	875	875	26.05%
h. Proficiency rate by grade level	26.05%	26.05%	

Display 3-10: Disaggregated Data for Mathematics Performance Grade 10 by FAY and Non-FAY Combined and FAY Only

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012)	**Mathematics Assessment Performance**	**Total**
	Grade 10	**%**
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY and non-FAY combined)	26.05%	26.05%
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY)	26.98%	26.98%

Display 3-11: Disaggregated Data for English Language Arts Performance: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs who Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data combined)	**English Language Arts Assessment Performance**						**Total**	
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	7,123	7,077	6,789	6,377	5,407	4,989	37,762	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,117	1,756	1,404	1,116	875	862	8,130	21.53%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,334	1,471	1,563	1,459	1,320	1,749	8,896	23.56%
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	477	472	443	486	370	390	2,638	6.99%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) baseline	3,928	3,699	3,410	3,061	2,565	3,001	19,664	52.08%
h. Proficiency rate by grade level	55.15%	52.27%	50.23%	48.00%	47.44%	60.15%	52.07%	

Display 3-12: Disaggregated Data for English Language Arts Performance Grades 3 – 8 by FAY and Non-FAY Combined and FAY Only

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012)	**English Language Arts Assessment Performance**						**Total**
	Grade 3	**Grade 4**	**Grade 5**	**Grade 6**	**Grade 7**	**Grade 8**	**%**
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY and non-FAY combined)	55.15%	52.27%	50.23%	48.00%	47.44%	60.15%	52.07%
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY)	56.68%	49.79%	51.09%	48.86%	48.08%	61.27%	52.39%

Display 3-13: Disaggregated Data for English Language Arts Performance: Number and Percent of Students with IEPs who Scored Proficient or Higher

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012) (FAY and non-FAY data combined)	**English Language Arts Assessment Performance**	**Total**	
	Grade 10	**#**	**%**
a. Children with IEPs	3,747	3,747	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	689	689	18.39%
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	983	983	26.23%
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	366	366	9.77%
g. Overall (b+c+d+e+f) baseline	2,038	2,038	54.39%
h. Proficiency rate by grade level	54.39%		

Display 3-14: Disaggregated Data for English Language Arts Performance Grade 10 by FAY and Non-FAY Combined and FAY Only

Statewide Assessment FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012)	**English Language Arts Assessment Performance**	**Total**
	Grade 10	%
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY and non-FAY combined)	54.39%	54.39%
Proficiency rate by grade level (FAY)	55.38%	55.38%

Valid and Reliable Data:

The accuracy of the data is ensured by sending the data through quality assurance and quality control established by both the assessment results team and the Information Technology (IT) section at the USOE.

Public Reporting Information:

The Utah State Office of Education's website, http://www.schools.utah.gov/main/, has links to numerous public documents including:

- The Utah Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy can be found at: http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/Special-Needs.aspx.
- Indicator 3 can be found at: http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/DOCS/assessment/1112ind3.aspx.
- Utah's CRT and UAA Results for Schools and the State at Public School Data (PSD) Gateway can be found at: http://www.schools.utah.gov/main/. Note: Schools without students taking the UAA have no UAA data publicly reported.
- The USOE Assessment webpage can be found at: http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/.
- The USOE Special Education webpage can be found at: http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/.
- Utah's State AMO Goal and Annual Targets for English Language Arts and Mathematics can be found at http://www.schools.utah.gov/data/Educational-Data/Accountability-School-Performance/AMOReport.aspx.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (Data Year 2011-2012):

Display 3-15: Trend Data for FFY 2008, FFY 2009, FFY 2010, and FFY 2011

Indicator	Topic	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
3A.2 AMO: Mathematics Grades 3-8 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	50.07%	54.23%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	42.71%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3A.2 AMO: Mathematics Grade 10 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	30.86%	36.62%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	29.41%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3A.2 AMO: English Language Arts Grades 3-8 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	54.40%	58.20%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	52.08%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3A.2 AMO: English Language Arts Grade 10 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	55.79%	59.47%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	56.76%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3B. Participation: Mathematics	Target	95%	95%	95%	95%
	Actual Data	99.51%	99.69%	99.42%	99.12%
	Met or Not Met	Met	Met	Met	Met

Indicator	Topic	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
3B. Participation: English Language Arts	Target	95%	95%	95%	95%
	Actual Data	99.58%	99.66%	99.56%	99.49%
	Met or Not Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
3C. Proficiency: Mathematics Grades 3-8 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	50.07%	54.23%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	45.79%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3C. Proficiency: Mathematics Grade 10 (2010) (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	30.86%	36.62%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	26.05%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3C. Proficiency: English Language Arts Grades 3-8 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	54.40%	58.20%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	52.07%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met
3C. Proficiency: English Language Arts Grade 10 (previous data are not available since FFY 2011 is baseline for AMO)	Target	---	---	55.79%	59.47%
	Actual Data	---	---	---	54.39%
	Met or Not Met	---	---	---	Not Met

Since Utah's 3A and 3C goals and targets will now be based on AMO, the past AYP-based target is no longer relevant. Utah's State AMO Goal and Annual Targets for English Language Arts and Mathematics can be found at http://www.schools.utah.gov/data/Educational-Data/Accountability-School-Performance/AMOReport.aspx. Utah will now be using the new ESEA Special Education AMO Goal and Targets. The targets for 3B remain the same.

Indicator 3A

In July 2012, Utah's ESEA Flexibility application was approved by the U.S. Department of Education. As a result, Utah no longer makes AYP determinations. Instead, AMO targets have been reset and a six year trajectory has been established beginning in FFY 2011 as per Utah's approved ESEA waiver.

AMOs will be based on the percent of students achieving proficiency on the State's CRTs separately in Mathematics and English Language Arts.

- Mathematics: results are based on CRTs in grades 3-6 and in the course-appropriate CRT thereafter, which includes Mathematics 7, Mathematics 8, Algebra, or Geometry for grades 7 and 8. High school proficiency rates will be determined by calculating the percent of 10th grade students who scored proficient on the Algebra I CRT in 10th grade year or a prior year.
- English Language Arts: CRT results in grades 3-8 and 10 are used to determine the percent of students who are proficient.
- Results from the UAA are included for students with significant cognitive disabilities approved to participate in this assessment.

AMO targets are set based on percent proficient in each of Mathematics and English Language Arts for each subgroup and each school in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the all-students group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The trajectory starts with the proficiency rates for 2010-2011 academic year.

The targets were not met due to the accelerated increments for students with disabilities.

- The percentage of LEAs reaching the AMO target for grades 3–8 Mathematics assessments was 42.71% with a target of 54.23%, which was not met.
- The percentage of LEAs reaching the AMO target for grade 10 Algebra 1 assessment was 29.41% with a target of 36.62%, which was not met.
- The percentage LEAs reaching the AMO target for grades 3–8 English Language Arts assessments was 52.08% with a target of 58.20%, which was not met.
- The percentage LEAs reaching the AMO target for grade 10 English Language Arts assessment was 56.76% for with a target of 59.47%, which was not met.

Indicator 3B

Data for 3B include both Full Academic Year (FAY) and non-FAY 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. The participation rate of students with disabilities has increased from 86% (Mathematics) and 92% (English 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 since 2006 who implement the policy. The policy and professional development include a description of the assessments in Utah, acceptable and appropriate accommodations, a description of who takes which assessments and why students with disabilities must participate in State assessments. 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 LEA Special Education Directors, LEA Assessment Directors, and LEA general and special educators on the Utah Assessment Participation and Accommodations Policy.

- The percentage of students with disabilities participating Mathematics assessments in FFY 2011 was 99.12% with a target of 95%, which was met.
- The percentage of students with disabilities participating English Language Arts assessments in FFY 2011 was 99.49% with a target of 95%, which was met.

Indicator 3C

In FFY 2008, the Utah 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.

Mathematics performance in FFY 2010 for students in grade 10 Algebra 1 may have decreased due to lack of prior experience in Algebra 1 content. Prior to spring 2011, LEAs were notified of the intensified focus on improving Mathematics instruction for students in general and special education. During 2010-2011, professional development in Mathematics progress monitoring was provided along with a pilot Mathematics content teacher education program, Project KNOTtT, which helped 32 out of 50 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.

Data for 3C previously had been based on FAY data. Beginning in FFY 2011 data from 3C are based on FAY and non-FAY combined. The calculations in 3C include all students with IEPs, in all grades

assessed, including students not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. No trend or comparison data will be calculated for 3C due to the change to FAY and non-FAY.

- The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on the grade 3–8 Mathematics assessments in FFY 2011 was 45.79% with a target of 54.23%, which was not met.
- The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on the grade 10 Algebra 1 Mathematics assessment in FFY 2011 was 26.05% with a target of 36.62%, which was not met.
- The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on the grades 3–8 English Language Arts assessments in FFY 2011 was 52.07% with a target of 58.20%, which was not met.
- The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on the grade 10 English Language Arts assessment in FFY 2011 was 54.39% with a target of 59.47%, which was not met.

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. Appropriate accommodations of students with disabilities as indicated by UPIPS monitoring data are ensured. 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 provided Statewide professional development on English Language Arts (literacy and reading) instruction and interventions for general and special educators. Completed and revised.
   - Professional development was provided to 331 educators on the English Language Arts Utah Core Curriculum and 114 educators on co-teaching.

2. Collaboratively provided Statewide professional development on Mathematics (numeracy) instruction and interventions for general and special educators. Completed and revised.
   - Professional development was provided to 44 special educators on Mathematics, 185 educators during the summer Mathematics series, and 114 educators on co-teaching.

3. Increased secondary Mathematics teachers' content knowledge via Project KNOTtT. Completed and revised.
   - Out of 50 secondary special educators who participated in the Project KNOTtT pilot, 32 passed the Mathematics PRAXIS.

4. Improved teachers' ability to adjust instruction for individual students with mathematics progress monitoring. Completed and ongoing.
   - Professional development was provided to 215 educators on progress monitoring.

5. Increase access to the Common Core in ELA and Mathematics and link specialized instruction to the Utah Core Standards through Standards-Based IEPs. Completed and revised
   - Professional development was provided to 301 educators on Standards-Based IEPs.

6. Improved Mathematics content instruction and knowledge for pre-service teachers by Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). Completed and ongoing.
   - Brigham Young University and USU added additional Mathematics content courses for pre-service teachers.
   - All IHEs are working to address changes in the Utah special education Mathematics endorsement for 2014-2015.

7. Provided professional development Statewide on the Extended Core Standards. Completed and ongoing.
   - Professional development was provided to 162 special educators, who instruct students with significant cognitive disabilities, to achieve awareness and knowledge of the Extended Core Standards.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance in Related Requirements (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	116
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	116
3. Number of FFY 2010 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 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (Same as the number (3) from above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	N/A
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	N/A

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

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Justifications
1. REVISED ACTIVITIES #1 and #2 Collaborate to provide Statewide conferences for all educators regarding classroom management, instruction, school-wide, and targeted interventions to support students in LRE.	2011 through 2013	USOE staff, UPDC staff, IDEA State-level Activities Set Aside Funding	General education and special education are working together to improve student outcomes including proficiency and LRE. Indicator 3 Activities 1 and 2 and Indicator 5 Activity 2 will be identical beginning FFY 2012.
2. Increase secondary Mathematics teachers' content knowledge via Project KNOTtT.	Completed and revised. 2011 (see REVISED ACTIVITY #1)	UPDC staff, USOE staff, IDEA State-level Activities Set Aside Funding	Project KNOTtT will increase secondary teachers' Mathematics content knowledge.
3. Improve teachers' ability to adjust instruction for individual students with Mathematics Progress Monitoring.	Completed and revised. 2011 (see REVISED ACTIVITY #1)	UPDC staff, USOE staff, IDEA State-level Activities Set Aside Funding	Mathematics progress monitoring will improve teachers' ability to adjust instruction for individual students.
4. Increase access to the Common Core in ELA and Mathematics and link specialized instruction to the Utah Core Standards through Standards-Based IEPs.	Completed and revised. 2011 (see REVISED ACTIVITY #1)	UPDC staff, USOE staff, IDEA State-level Activities Set Aside Funding	Increase access to the Utah Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics and link specialized instruction to the Utah Core Standards.

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Justifications
5. REVISED ACTIVITY #7 Provide professional development Statewide on the Essential Elements for English Language Arts and Mathematics and the Extended Core Standards for Science.	2012 through 2013	USOE staff, UPDC staff, IDEA State-level Activities Set Aside Funding	Utah has adopted the Essential Elements from the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment grant for English Language Arts and Mathematics. Utah will continue to use the Extended Core Standards for Science. Professional development will be provided to educators to increase content knowledge in these subjects.