

UTAH

STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SSIP)  
PHASE III YEAR 3

Sydnee Dickson  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Leah Voorhies  
Assistant Superintendent of Student Support

Utah State Board of Education  
250 East 500 South  
PO Box 144200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200

April 2019



ADA Compliant: April 2019

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
Table of Figures.....	ii
SSIP Phase III Year 3 Introduction .....	1
A. Summary of SSIP Phase III Year 3.....	3
A.1. Theory of Action or logic model for the SSIP, including SIMR .....	3
A.2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies .....	4
A.3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date .....	5
A.4. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies .....	10
B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP .....	11
B.1. Description of the State’s SSIP implementation progress .....	11
B.2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation.....	21
C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes .....	23
C.1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan .....	23
C.2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary .....	28
C.3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation .....	29
D. Data Quality Issues.....	31
D.1. Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR due to quality of the evaluation data.....	31
E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements .....	34
E.1. Assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements.....	34
F. Plans for Next Year.....	46
F.1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline .....	46
F.2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes .....	46
F.3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers.....	46
F.4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance .....	47
Appendix .....	48
Appendix A: SSIP Presentations 2018–2019 .....	48

## Table of Figures

Figure 1: Percentage of sixth through eighth grade students without disabilities, students with disabilities, and students categorized SLD/SLI who were proficient on the SAGE in mathematics in 2013–2014. ....	2
Figure 2: Utah’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action. ....	3
Figure 3: Utah’s State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) progress. ....	4
Figure 4: Percentage of students with disabilities who are proficient in mathematics on Indicator 3 in both third through eighth grades (aggregated) and grade 10. ....	9
Figure 5: Math proficiency on SAGE and DLM for students with disabilities in grades 3–8 and 10 as reported on Indicator 3 for FFY2013-2017. ....	34
Figure 6: Percentage of students whose parents have opted out of taking the SAGE for both general education students and students with disabilities. ....	35
Figure 7: Results of the SIMR for all students with disabilities in Utah for FFY2013–2017. ....	36
Figure 8: Percentage of students with disabilities who participated in taking the ACT in 2014–2015, 2015–2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-18 for (a) all students with disabilities enrolled in Utah schools, (b) all students with SLI or SLD classifications enrolled in Utah schools. ....	37
Figure 9: Percentage of special education teachers with mathematics endorsements in Utah. ....	38
Figure 10: Percentage of students with disabilities who achieved an ACT score of 18 or higher by eleventh grade. ....	40

## SSIP Phase III Year 3 Introduction

Utah's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) describes the state system and its capacity to assist Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to develop the needed capacity to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and then to evaluate the impact of Utah's improvement efforts. These improvement efforts align with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The success of the SSIP requires systematic improvement across the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) and LEAs to leverage existing strengths while simultaneously closing system gaps. For the SSIP to be successful, the USBE and LEAs need to:

- Increase capacity to implement the SSIP,
- Align and leverage current initiatives,
- Increase utilization of evidence-based practices (EBPs),
- Improve infrastructure and coordination for delivering effective professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA),
- Increase the use of effective dissemination strategies,
- Increase meaningful engagement of state and local stakeholders around SSIP efforts,
- Increase capacity to effectively utilize available TA resources, and
- Increase capacity to implement general supervision systems that support effective implementation of the IDEA and ESSA.


These combined improvement efforts have and will continue to lead to improved educational outcomes for all students in the area of mathematics proficiency, which in turn will also improve state results in graduation, dropout, and post-school outcomes as students with disabilities have the mathematics computation and application skills they need to pass required high school mathematics courses, take and pass the American College Testing (ACT) assessment with a Utah college-ready score, get accepted into post-high training programs, colleges, and universities, acquire competitive employment, and/or live independently.

The State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) was selected after a review of Utah mathematics data over the five previous years on statewide assessments, in which proficiency trends were obvious. To improve achievement in mathematics, stakeholders identified three primary focus areas for USBE and LEAs:

- I. Administrator, teacher, parent, and student attitudes, expectations and behavior (resulting in some IEP Team decisions that limit grade-level Core mathematics instruction);
- II. Teacher understanding of mathematics standards and effective instruction; and
- III. An educational system that decreases general education instructional support and interventions in secondary settings, during a time when the mathematics Core standards become more rigorous and abstract.

Figure 1 illustrates the proficiency gaps that led stakeholders to reach consensus on the SIMR. All students with disabilities in grades six through eight had a baseline proficiency rate on the SAGE mathematics assessment of 14.9%, while those with the disability categories of SLD and SLI only had a proficiency rate of 7.1%. Utah's stakeholders determined that Utah needed to cut that gap in half and increase statewide proficiency by 11.11% for students with SLD or SLI in grades six through eight on the Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) end-of level statewide mathematics test over a five-year period (2014–2019). (To review the process

Utah used to achieve stakeholder consensus on the SIMR, review the [SSIP Phases I and II reports](https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/datareporting?mid=936&tid=1) [https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/datareporting?mid=936&tid=1]).



*Figure 1: Percentage of sixth through eighth grade students without disabilities, students with disabilities, and students categorized SLD/SLI who were proficient on the SAGE in mathematics in 2013–2014.*

Utah then reiterated the process to bring stakeholders to consensus about what specific improvement activities would need to be implemented in order to achieve the SIMR and how the USBE and LEAs would evaluate Utah’s progress toward achieving the SIMR.

The focus of the SSIP Phase III Year 3 was on supporting LEAs with the implementation of mathematics EBPs that will lead to the measurable improvement in the SIMR and in evaluating the SSIP’s impact. Phase III Year 3 builds on the data and infrastructure analyses, broad Coherent Improvement Strategies, and Theory of Action developed in Phase I. Phase III Year 3 updates Utah’s responses to the Implementation Matrix of improvement activities, the Evaluation Matrix and the Evaluation Questions developed in Phase II.

Utah’s SSIP Phase III Year 3 report includes an account of Utah’s progress implementing improvement activities, allocating resources, and meeting timelines required for the implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies, as well as an account of the impact the SSIP has had on mathematics outcomes for students with disabilities.

## A. Summary of SSIP Phase III Year 3

### A.1. Theory of Action or logic model for the SSIP, including SIMR

Utah's Theory of Action design started during the OSEP TA visit in October 2014. The Theory of Action is a brief but comprehensive representation of Utah's long-term, transformative and sustainable plan to improve mathematics outcomes for students with disabilities.

Utah's Theory of Action began with the identification of the three root cause concerns for the poor achievement of students with disabilities in mathematics in grades six through eight identified during Phase I of the SSIP. Those concerns were transformed into three broad Coherent Improvement Strategies, including High Expectations and Beliefs, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) in Secondary Settings. The Theory of Action then demonstrates how each Coherent Improvement Strategy will leverage the strengths of current USBE and LEA initiatives and priorities to build LEA capacity for improvement, while at the same time decreasing the impact of infrastructure gaps. Finally, the Theory of Action clearly articulates Utah's SIMR.

The power of Utah's Theory of Action is that as stakeholders address the implementation of Utah's three Coherent Improvement Strategies, the mathematics achievement of not just students with disabilities in grades six through eight, but all students in Utah will improve.




Figure 2: Utah's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action.

Utah’s SIMR is to increase statewide proficiency by 11.11% for students categorized as SLI or SLD in grades six through eight on the SAGE end-of-level statewide mathematics test over a five-year period (2014–2019).




Figure 3: Utah’s State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) progress.

**A.2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies**

As outlined in Utah’s Theory of Action, Utah is focusing on three broad Coherent Improvement Strategies, which will result in correcting the root causes identified in the SSIP Phase I and ensure achievement of Utah’s SIMR.

- I. Administrators, teachers, parents, and students will see the need and expect students with disabilities to master mathematics content (resulting in IEP Team decisions that require and scaffold grade-level Core mathematics instruction);
- II. General education and special education teachers will understand mathematics standards and effective instruction will improve for all students; and
- III. The USBE and LEAs will increase general education tiered instructional supports and interventions in secondary settings, to scaffold mathematics Core standards as they become more rigorous and abstract (i.e., MTSS).

Each Coherent Improvement Strategy has seven components that Utah determined must be considered to adequately implement the strategy:

Strategy I: High Expectations and Beliefs components are:

- Inclusion in grade-level Core content;
- Assessment;
- Graduation requirements and College and Career Ready (CCR) plans;
- Leadership;
- Preservice and in-service professional learning;
- Data and EBPs;
- Active engagement of all school personnel;

- IEP Team decisions; and
- Fiscal support.

Strategy II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction components are:

- Math content and pedagogy to provide effective instruction through Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and evidence-based interventions;
- Leadership;
- Preservice and in-service professional learning;
- Data and EBPs;
- Active engagement of all school personnel;
- IEP Team decisions; and
- Fiscal support.

Strategy III: MTSS in Secondary Settings the components are:

- Infrastructure, scale, and fidelity;
- Leadership;
- Preservice and in-service professional learning;
- Data and EBPs;
- Active engagement of all school personnel;
- IEP Team decisions; and
- Fiscal support.

The impact of the Coherent Improvement Strategies, based upon the root causes and components, will result in vital changes leading to increased student proficiency. The improvement activities that Utah began implementing during the 2016–2017 school year have focused on the Coherent Improvement Strategies and will be discussed in depth in Sections B. and C. of this report.

As outlined in the SSIP Phase II report, Utah created a Cross Department SSIP Implementation Team (CDIT). The CDIT is responsible for ensuring that improvement activities are implemented, and then reviewing the evaluation data from those activities to suggest changes and/or additions. The team leads are from the USBE Special Education Services (SES) section (the former SSIP Coordinator, who is the Assistant Superintendent of Student Support, a role that encompasses State Special Education Director) and the USBE Teaching and Learning (T&L) Section (the USBE Secondary Mathematics Coordinator), to align and leverage existing improvement efforts and determine the need for new ones. The CDIT includes members from the USBE SES and T&L sections, as well as from the USBE Assessment, Student Support, Digital Teaching and Learning sections, the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Utah Multi-Tiered System of Supports (UMTSS) project, the Utah Personnel Development Network (UPDN), and a representative of the Utah Council of Teachers of Mathematics (UCTM). Additionally, to provide cross-pollination of mathematics improvement efforts inside and outside the USBE, a member of the CDIT sits on the Board of the UCTM and, as of the 2018-2019 school year, is a voting member.

### **A.3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date**

The implementation of EBPs has been the biggest concern of Utah moving forward with implementing the SSIP. Research in EBPs for students who are struggling in mathematics is



behind that of literacy/English Language Arts (ELA), and research regarding students with disabilities and EBPs in mathematics is even less prolific.

The USBE formed the CDIT to guide the work of SSIP implementation at the state level. The members are working together to advertise the SSIP. They are also creating resources that LEAs can implement to improve stakeholders' expectations and beliefs about the ability of students with disabilities to master mathematics content, to improve teacher content knowledge (especially that of special education teachers), to improve Core Tier I instruction using EBPs that align with the [Utah Effective Teaching Standards and Indicators](https://schools.utah.gov/curr/educatoreffectiveness) (<https://schools.utah.gov/curr/educatoreffectiveness>), and to provide evidence-based interventions within an MTSS context.

Several national organizations are creating repositories of EPBs and evidence-based programs for educational agencies to access. The CDIT is distributing the website information of these repositories to LEAs so they can review the information and evaluate their own practices and procedures. These repositories include:

- [What Works Clearinghouse](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW/Results?filters=,Math) (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW/Results?filters=,Math>)
- [American Institutes for Research](https://www.air.org/topic/p-12-education-and-social-development/mathematics-education) (<https://www.air.org/topic/p-12-education-and-social-development/mathematics-education>)
- [Evidence for ESSA](https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/math/elementary) (<https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/math/elementary>)

The USBE has also reached out to the National Center on Systemic Improvement (NCSI) state collaborative on Mathematics, the National Center on Intensive Interventions (NCII), and the National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance at the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) to accumulate resources that are shared with LEAs regarding the use of EBPs, including multi-tiered supports for students who struggle in mathematics.

The list of EBPs that CDIT began providing professional development about during Phase III included:

- Ensuring students with disabilities have access to, involvement in, and make progress in the general curriculum
  - Use of UDL<sup>1</sup> framework for engineering the instructional environment to increase engagement, representation, and action and expression
- The five anchors of differentiation<sup>2</sup> (and incorporating them into the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics' [NCTM's] eight mathematical practice standards)
  - Response opportunities
  - Strategic instruction
  - Instructional explicitness
  - Instructional intensity
  - Instructional time
- Strategies for instructional delivery for mathematics
  - Advanced organizer
  - Concept maps
  - Concrete/Representational/Abstract (CRA)
  - Manipulatives

---

<sup>1</sup> Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST), [cast.org](http://cast.org)

<sup>2</sup> Mathematics RTI: A Problem-Solving Approach to Creating an Effective Model by: Davis Allsopp, Patricia Alvarez McHatton, Sharon Nichole Estcok Ray, Jennie L. Farmer.

- Modeling
- Questioning
- Representation
- Project FACT 4 to 6<sup>3</sup> (fractions intervention)
  - Figure out my approach
  - Act on it
  - Compare my reasoning with a peer's
  - Tie it up in a paragraph
- Use of the [Coherence Map](http://achievethecore.org/coherence-map/) (<http://achievethecore.org/coherence-map/>)
- Collaborative study and student interviews<sup>4</sup>
- Open-ended low threshold, high ceiling tasks; offering choices of tasks; developing student self-awareness and responsibility; and exit tickets<sup>5</sup>
- Comprehensive Mathematics Instruction (CMI)<sup>6</sup>

Almost as important as implementing EBPs is decreasing the use of practices that evidence has shown to be ineffective such as within-class grouping, ability grouping, retention, multi-grade/age classes<sup>7</sup> and leveled grouping, ability tracking, extending a mathematics course over two years, and low expectations<sup>8</sup>. The CDIT continues to be concerned that these ineffective practices have led to students with disabilities taking off-grade-level mathematics courses and assessments. Thus, as LEAs implement EBPs and discontinue the use of ineffective practices, students with disabilities will have more equitable access to grade-level Core content.

The SSIP implementation plan in the SSIP Phase II outlined a multi-tiered approach to SSIP implementation. Each Utah LEA has begun to consider its stage of implementation of EBPs for mathematics instruction and MTSS in secondary settings. For LEAs with multiple schools, the LEA is also considering the implementation stages of each school, then determining the implementation drivers that will leverage the most change within the LEA and individual schools. This is yet another way in which the USBE is individualizing PD and TA for LEAs.

The universal tier of SSIP implementation is designed so that *all* LEAs may access in-person trainings, webinars, book studies, and materials about EBPs, etc. to support their mathematics improvement activities. The USBE has been providing “universal” supports to all LEAs in the state, while providing “targeted” supports to LEAs who requested PD and TA related to mathematics in their special education Program Improvement Plans (PIPs), and then more “intensive” supports to those LEAs determined by the SSIP Phase I data and infrastructure

---

<sup>3</sup> Kihara, S. A., Witzel, B., Dai, T., Rouse, A. G., & Unker, B. Understanding fractions via writing-to-learn arguments within a multi-tiered system of supports. In S. Kihara & B. Witzel (Chairs), *Overcoming difficult areas in mathematics for students with disabilities: Potential approaches and interventions*.

<sup>4</sup> Tapper, John. (2012). *Solving for Why: Understanding, Assessing, And Teaching Students Who Struggle with Math*.

<sup>5</sup> Boaler, Jo. (2016). *Mathematical Mindsets: Unleashing Students' Potential through Creative Math, Inspiring Messages and Innovative Teaching*

<sup>6</sup> Hendrickson, S., Hilton, S., Bahr, D. The *Comprehensive Mathematics Instruction (CMI) Framework: A new lens for examining teaching and learning in the Mathematics Classroom*. [http://www.pcschools.us/woad-local/media/cmi\\_article.pdf](http://www.pcschools.us/woad-local/media/cmi_article.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge.

<sup>8</sup> National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM). (2014). *Principles to Actions: Ensuring Mathematical Success for All*. Reston, VA: NCTM.

analyses to be in a position to leverage the most change and move the state toward SIMR achievement. The USBE SES and CDIT are using the outcome data received from these activities as part of a continuous feedback and improvement loop.

When LEAs identified in their special education Program Improvement Plan (PIP) that they needed support to improve mathematics outcomes for students with disabilities, they had the ability to request PD and/or TA support from the USBE and UPDN. In this manner, the USBE is providing “targeted” support to *some* LEAs who self-identify the need. Five LEAs have gone beyond simply requesting PD and have begun “targeted” pilot projects during Phase III Year 2, including Cache School District, Carbon School District, Ogden School District, and two charter schools, Legacy Preparatory Academy and Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery. The USBE SES and CDIT are using the fidelity of implementation data received from these PD activities as part of a continuous feedback and improvement loop.

A *few* LEAs selected during Phase I of the SSIP have been receiving intensive support to implement pilot projects that utilize EBPs and eliminate practices that are not evidence-based. A group of eight LEAs participated in the initial implementation and received intensive support from the USBE. Five large LEAs were chosen to participate: Davis School District, Granite School District, Jordan School District, Alpine School District, and Washington County School District. Two medium-sized LEAs participated, including Iron County School District and Wasatch School District. One small LEA, Spectrum Academy, a charter school, also participated.

In past years, Utah has analyzed the progress of the LEAs who received intensive, and even targeted supports compared to the rest of the state and demonstrated that those LEAs were making more progress toward achieving the SIMR. However, as the CDIT has analyzed the results this past year, that delineation no longer seems relevant. The LEAs who are receiving intensive and targeted supports are also participating in the universal supports and schools in those LEAs who are not receiving intensive support are receiving universal support. Thus, the CDIT has recommended not disaggregating results between the three tiers of LEA support above and has also recommended removing the evaluation question that requires disaggregation between the intensive LEAs and all other Utah LEAs from this and future SSIP Phase III reports.

### **Brief overview of the year’s evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes**

Utah’s evaluation plan for the SSIP has two major parts. The first is the SIMR target calculation, which is a simple measure of the annual percentage of Utah students with SLI or SLD in grades six through eight who are proficient on the SAGE mathematics assessment. This is the data that Utah will report to OSEP in the GRADS360 SPP/APR online reporting application. By 2019, Utah’s goal is to improve the percentage by 11.11% (from 7.10% at baseline to 18.20%) over a five-year period. The SIMR would require that Utah increase its proficiency for this group of students with disabilities by 2.2% per year.

In FFY2014, the target for Utah’s SIMR was 9.32%. Utah’s actual data was 8.70% proficiency, which did not meet the target, but which was an improvement of 1.60 over baseline. In FFY2015, the target for Utah’s SIMR was 11.52%. Utah’s actual data was 9.90%, which did not meet the target, but which was an improvement of 1.20 over FFY2014 and 2.84 over baseline. In FFY2016, the actual data for Utah’s SIMR was 9.80%, which was a drop from the previous

year. In FFY2016, the USBE was disappointed that the SIMR target was not met and even more disappointed that Utah’s SIMR target group regressed.

However, in FFY2017, Utah’s data again increased. The target was 15.98%, and Utah’s actual data was 10.00 which did not meet the target but is an improvement of 0.20 over the previous year’s data.

As reported in Utah’s SPP/APR Indicator 3, students with disabilities in grades three through eight had a mathematics baseline in FFY2013 of 20.11%, which decreased in FFY2014 to 17.06%, then increased by 0.55 to 17.61% in FFY2015. Scores again increased for this age group in FFY2016 to 17.90% and in FFY2017 to 18.40%. In grade 10, Utah had a mathematics proficiency baseline in FFY2013 of 7.86%, with decreases in FFY2014 to 7.15%, in FFY2015 to 7.08% and in FFY2016 to 6.50%. Proficiency had a slight rebound in FFY2017 to 6.60%, but still has not reached FFY 2013 levels.

In FFY2017, Utah’s achievement in grades three through eight made good improvement to 18.40%, but only slightly increased to 6.60% in grade 10. It appears from these initial results that the focusing Utah’s SSIP on middle school mathematics is having a positive impact on proficiency, the impact is not being sustained into the higher grades.




Figure 4: Percentage of students with disabilities who are proficient in mathematics on Indicator 3 in both third through eighth grades (aggregated) and grade 10.

The second part of the evaluation is the periodic evaluation of the components within each of the three Coherent Improvement Strategies, as defined by the Evaluation Questions and the Evaluation Matrix in the SSIP Phase II report. The outcome data related to each Evaluation Question and each component in the Evaluation Matrix will be provided in an Evaluation Matrix Progress chart in Section E.1. All data analyses are appropriate for the type of data identified. Most data reported are counts or percentages as specified in the Evaluation Matrix.

#### **A.4. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies**

Utah has not made any changes to the SIMR, the Coherent Improvement Strategies in the SSIP, or the Theory of Action.

However, Utah has made several minor changes to the activities in the Implementation Matrix from the SSIP Phase III Year 3 report.

Utah has completed two activities within the timeline outlined in the Implementation Matrix. Completed activities were removed from the Implementation Matrix.

Under High Expectation and Beliefs, Utah completed:

Facilitate a book study on *Mindset* by Carol S. Dweck and *Mathematical Mindsets* by Jo Boaler for Educators.

Under Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Utah has completed:

Provide LEA-selected intensive and targeted LEA staff with intensive PD, including workshops, webinars, and lesson studies on the implementation of the EBPs in mathematics for grades six through eight.

During the SSIP Phase III, as a direct result of stakeholder feedback, and SSIP data and feedback reviews conducted by the CDIT, in FFY2017 Utah had added one new activity. Under High Expectations and Beliefs, Utah added:

Facilitate an online book study on *Grit* by Angel Duckworth for parents.

[Over the course of the three years of SSIP implementation, USBE in collaboration with the Utah Parent Center (UPC; Utah's Parent Training and Information Center) has led five sessions of three different online book studies and over 800 individuals have participated (though some of the same people have participated in discussions of all three books so there are not 800 distinct individuals who have participated.)]

Though this section does not specifically ask for highlights to changes in the Evaluation Questions, as mentioned earlier, Utah has chosen to delete two Evaluation Questions that no longer seem relevant to the evaluation of the SSIP:

**Coherent Improvement Strategy II, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Evaluation Question Three:** Did Utah's participation in the CEEDAR and CCSSO's NTEP projects result in increased access to mathematics coursework by special education preservice teachers?

CCSSO's NTEP work has finished and Utah is participating in CEEDAR 2.0 but is no longer focusing the work on mathematics, so this question is no longer relevant to the SSIP.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy II, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Evaluation Question Four:** Was the scaling up of I-9 LEA SSIP pilot projects successful in increasing the assessment results of LEAs who adopted the projects?

The CDIT, in collaboration with other stakeholder groups has determined that since nearly all LEAs are now participating in universal activities, supports disaggregating the data by the LEAs who began intensive mathematics improvements projects is no longer a valid measure of progress. Thus, this evaluation question is no longer relevant to the SSIP.

## B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

### B.1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress

Utah is pleased with the SSIP implementation progress made during FFY2017. The CDIT led the implementation effort by meeting regularly as a large group and also creating committees that fall under two major categories: Comprehensive Outreach and Outcomes. Each committee created goals for the 2018–2019 school year, including a goal about how to use their work to support and improve the CDIT messaging of SSIP implementation and outcomes.

The Comprehensive Outreach team created goals related to public relations, communication, identifying gap audiences, parent outreach, and MTSS implementation. The Outreach team met with members to create and complete the following goals:

- Develop the [Landing Page](http://www.mathforallstudents.schools.utah.gov) (www.mathforallstudents.schools.utah.gov)
  - Create a video about the implementation of the SSIP **(this activity is probably what the CDIT is most proud of during this SSIP reporting year; it took an enormous amount of collaborative work and has received raved reviews across the state)**
- Identify gap audiences/stakeholders who are not involved and do not receive information and determine avenues for communication
  - Identification of stakeholders
  - Previous alignment of services meeting notes
- Dissemination and professional learning for the MTSS in Mathematics Framework
  - Over 1,000 MTSS Framework documents provided to educators across Utah
  - Statewide summer professional learning centered on implementation of Framework
- Expand mathematics website to include MTSS Framework in Mathematics support documents
- Provide professional learning opportunities for CDIT and USBE staff:
  - Evidence-based practices professional learning to meet ESSA requirements
  - The New Teacher Project (TNTP): *The Opportunity Myth*
  - Teach to Lead (TTL) Summit in collaboration with the Hope Street Teacher Fellows, bringing together multiple cohorts across the state
- Collaborate with public relations firm to look for and highlight bright spots across state
  - KSL News Teacher Feature
  - News radio interviews and blogs
- Develop and implement opportunities for parent involvement: parent book study
- Improve and increase the co-teaching cohort
- Increase teacher leaders in general education and special education through the Coaching Institute

The Outcomes team created goals related to data gathering, beliefs survey and analysis, and student outcomes. The Outcomes team met with members to create and complete the following goals:

- Develop expectations and beliefs survey second administration

- Disseminate expectations and beliefs survey second administration via multiple modes of social media, email, and additional public media options
- Analysis of expectations and beliefs survey second administration and compare to baseline data from 2015

Each committee has a facilitator responsible for setting the agendas for the monthly meetings, monitoring the progress of the relevant improvement activities in the Implementation Matrix, and monitoring the committee members' progress presenting on the SSIP to myriad parent groups, groups of educators and administrators, and other stakeholders.

A report of the progress of implementation of each of the activities listed is included below in the Implementation Matrix Progress chart. The chart details Utah's implementation progress in the "Progress" column. It details whether the intended *timeline* (T) has been met; the *fidelity* (F) of the planned measure; and what has been *accomplished*, including intended outputs and *milestones* that have been met (A/M). (For the sake of brevity, students with disabilities is abbreviated as SWD in the chart.)

### Coherent Improvement Strategy I: High Expectations and Beliefs

Administrators, teachers, parents, and students will understand the utility of and expect students with disabilities (SWD) to master mathematics content (resulting in Individualized Education Program [IEP] Team decisions that require and scaffold grade-level Core mathematics instruction).

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
a. Use the CDIT to produce SSIP information for dissemination, recommend statewide implementation plan, and review evaluation data from SSIP improvement activities.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: Disseminated info about SSIP and EBPs throughout Utah to education staff and other stakeholders; reviewed intensive LEA pilot project data and initially available “targeted” LEA data, and Evaluation Question progress data.
b. Create and disseminate a beliefs and expectations survey related to SWD and mathematics access and achievement.	2015–2019	T: Done in 2015 and again in 2018 F: N/A A/M: 1,532 stakeholders responded to initial survey; (Baseline) data was included in the SSIP Phase II report. 3,172 stakeholders responded to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> (Progress) survey; data is included in Section C.1. of this report.
c. Continue to disseminate copies of the executive summary of Phase I of the SSIP to stakeholders statewide.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: Document is available online.
d. Disseminate copies of the executive summary of Phase II of the SSIP to stakeholders statewide.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: Document is available online.
e. Present at state and LEA conferences/meetings on the purpose of the SSIP and educators’ roles in SIMR achievement and how their expectations and beliefs affect supports provided to SWD, course-taking patterns, and college and career readiness.	2015–2018	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: See SSIP PD tracking table in Appendix A.



Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
f. Present at state and local conferences/meetings on the purpose of the SSIP and parents' roles in SIMR achievement and how their expectations and beliefs affect how IEPs are written, what services SWD receive, course taking patterns, and college and career readiness.	2015–2018	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: See SSIP PD tracking table in Appendix A.
g. Discuss expectation and beliefs during parent intakes at the UPC, add at least one slide about expectation and beliefs to the IEP parent workshops; add at least two content items to the UPC website which address expectations and beliefs; train UPC staff once annually on this topic; include at least one item in the UPC emails or social media about mastering grade-level mathematics; create a math resource list to assist parents in helping their children learn grade-level mathematics content.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: The UPC has trained all its staff on the SSIP, including the need to increase expectations for their own SWD and to help other parents do so; updated the “Transition of Adult Life Parent Handbook” to include information about having high expectations; discussed expectations and beliefs during parent calls; added content items about expectations to their website and to emails they sent out; created a resource list and information sheets to help parents help their SWD with mathematics; and co-sponsored the first year of <i>Grit</i> book studies.
h. Provide PD and TA to teachers of students with significant cognitive disabilities.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Participants upload copies of lesson plans and formative assessments; USBE staff provide feedback A/M: Provided regional two-day trainings.
i. Engage a public relations firm to create and disseminate a statewide public awareness campaign about the SSIP.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: Contracted with The Summit Group in August of 2016. Published several state and national articles about SSIP work, largely mindset- and co-teaching-related. Facilitated several radio spots about SSIP work, largely mindset- and co-teaching-related. Created a video outlining Utah’s implementation of the SSIP that can found on the CDIT’s <a href="#">landing page</a> .

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
j. Present at state and LEA conferences/meetings on the progress of the SSIP and review the purpose of the SSIP and educators' roles in SIMR achievement and how their expectations and beliefs affect supports provided to SWD, course-taking patterns, and college and career readiness.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: See SSIP PD tracking table in Appendix A.
k. Present at state and local conferences/meetings on the progress of the SSIP and review the purpose of the SSIP and parents' roles in SIMR achievement and how their expectations and beliefs affect how IEPs are written, what services SWD receive, course-taking patterns, and college and career readiness.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: N/A A/M: See SSIP PD tracking table in Appendix A.
l. Continue to align USBE initiatives and all instructional improvement efforts to move the USBE along the Collaboration Continuum.	2015–2019	T: Ongoing F: N/A A/M: Participating in NCSI's System Alignment Learning Collaborative and CCSSO's School and District Improvement SCASS.
m. Request increased funding for public education, especially programs and services for SWD.	2015–2019	T: Ongoing F: N/A A/M: The 2019 Legislature increased the Weighted Pupil Unit (WPU) (per student funding) by an additional 4.0%.
n. Facilitate an online book study on <i>Grit</i> by Angela Duckworth for parents.	2018–2019	T: Ongoing F: N/A A/M: 300 parents participated in the two sessions of the book study (three online meetings were held for each session).
p. Create a website on which a repository of mathematics resources can be provided for parents, educators, administrators and other stakeholders.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: The CDIT created the <a href="#">landing page</a> on the USBE's website with the help of the contracted PR firm. A/M: in collaboration with the PR firm, the CDIT created a video about Utah's implementation of the SSIP which can also be found on the site. The CDIT continues to add content to the landing page.

## Coherent Improvement Strategy II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction

General education and special education teacher understanding of mathematics standards and effective instruction will improve.

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
a. Facilitate a book study on <i>Principles to Actions</i> , by NCTM, for educators.	2015–2018	<p>T: Done and ongoing</p> <p>F: Embedded activities into the PD that demonstrates participants’ understanding and ability to apply the information.</p> <p>A/M: Over 500 participants have completed or will complete the <i>Principles to Actions</i> course online by the end of April 2019.</p>
b. Facilitate an online book study and webinar on the Mathematics Practice Standards published by NCTM for educators.	2015–2019	<p>T: Done and ongoing</p> <p>F: Embedded activities into the PD that demonstrates participants’ understanding and ability to apply the information.</p> <p>A/M: Over 500 participants have completed or will complete the <i>Principles to Actions</i> course online by the end of April 2019. 25 participants have completed the <i>Magnifying Sixth Grade Mathematics</i> online in 2018-2019.</p>
c. Facilitate an annual coteaching cohort of general and special education teachers focusing on both EBPs in coteaching as well as mathematics content and instruction and intervention using EBPs.	2015–2019	<p>T: Done and ongoing</p> <p>F: Student pre- and post-test content knowledge data and three observations/coaching visits per team are provided.</p> <p>A/M: 8 new coteaching teams (consisting of a general educator and a special educator) and 11 teams continued for a second year participated in a year-long cohort training on coteaching using mathematics content.</p>
d. Support the initial eight LEAs receiving intensive support from the USBE in scaling up effective pilot projects using EBPs.	2016–2019	<p>T: Done and ongoing</p> <p>F: Each of the eight LEAs have continued their SSIP implementation work and each has a fidelity measure specific to its project.</p> <p>A/M: Each LEA continues to implement its plan and scale up as appropriate and as resources are available.</p>

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
e. Support LEAs in adopting and implementing successful “targeted” pilot projects using EBPs.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Three LEAs continued “targeted” projects, including Cache District, Ogden District, and Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery (WCSD). A/M: WCSD’s formative data is outlined in Section C.1.
f. Provide professional development on Universal Design for Learning (UDL) within the context of mathematics instruction to general and special education staff.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Embedded activities into the PD that demonstrate participants’ understanding and ability to apply the information. A/M: All mathematics PD and TA included UDL.
g. Provide special education administrators an overview of an EBP in the SpEdOmeter newsletter monthly.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Provide information in the SpEdOmeter about EBPs. A/M: Created a monthly “Math Corner” in which an EBP is outlined and explained.
h. Work with School Improvement section of the Student Support department on Student Support Teams (SSTs) to ensure mathematics proficiency improvements are considered during the school improvement process for the lowest-performing Utah schools.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Ensure school designated as having “Improvement” or “Turnaround” status propose only the use of EBPs in their improvement plans. A/M: SSIP Coordinator is the Assistant Superintendent of Student Support and supervises of the School Turnaround team, providing PD, TA and coaching to Turnaround principals.
i. Provide PD and TA regarding mathematics improvements to LEAs based on their special education Program Improvement Plan (PIPs).	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Embedded activities into the PD that demonstrate participants’ understanding and ability to apply the information. A/M: Nearly all LEAs participated in PD/TA regarding mathematics instruction improvement.

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
j. Create courses and/or a cohort of teachers to earn the Special Education Mathematics Endorsement.	2016–2019	T: Ongoing F: NA A/M: USBE offered a stipend reimbursement for taking courses toward the endorsement; one LEAs is providing a cohort of teachers with the coursework; USBE continues to work with two (of four) Regional Resource Centers in Utah to offer regional endorsement courses.
k. Provide co-sponsorships to Utah agencies and associations (such as Utah CEC, Utah Association of School Psychologists [UASP], UCTM, Utah’s Council of Administrators of Special Education [CASE]) for conferences and conference sessions that address mathematics achievement and any of the three Coherent Improvement Strategies.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Reviewed presentation material to ensure information was evidenced-based. A/M: Provided co-sponsorships to Utah CEC, Utah CASE, UCTM, and the Charter School Special Education Directors (CSPEDD) association.
l. Participate in the NCSI Mathematics State Collaborative.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: NA A/M: Participated in face-to-face meetings, monthly lead calls, and quarterly team calls.
m. Provide PD and TA to administrators and educators about effective instructional coaching for mathematics and how to conduct fidelity checks of implementation.	2015–2017	T: Done and ongoing F: Provided PD and TA, including forms, to coaches and those receiving coaching on effective instructional coaching and fidelity checks. A/M: 48 participants had initial training on mathematics content coaching, including guidelines for coaching cycles, role of coach, and utilizing a coaching protocol. Over four years, over 180 teacher leaders have participated in the Leadership/Coaching Institute.
n. Provide PD and TA to educators about developing, delivering, and evaluating PD, including the provision of transfer supports, and using the seven step Effective Professional Development Cycle.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Embedded activities into the PD that demonstrate participants’ understanding and ability to apply the information. A/M: USBE staff and several LEAs received PD, TA and coaching on development of evidence-based PD.

### Coherent Improvement Strategy III: MTSS in Secondary Settings

The state and local educational agencies will increase general education instructional supports and interventions in secondary settings, to scaffold mathematics Core standards as they become more rigorous and abstract.

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
a. Create an online training module describing systems and instructional components required to implement an MTSS for mathematics.	2016–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Created required quizzes for each section of the online module. All participants must pass each quiz before the system will allow them to continue into the next section of the module. A/M: 101 participants have taken the course.
b. Update the Utah three-tiered mathematics instruction and intervention document and disseminate statewide.	2016–2019	T: Done. F: NA A/M: Utah’s MTSS in Mathematics document was released in 2018 and includes a Framework (aligned to USBE MTSS Critical Components), plus additional research and professional development supports. More than 1000 copies have already been distributed.
c. Provide annual data drill TA meetings that explain LEA child count and proficiency data and teach LEAs how to identify root causes and then how to turn root causes into special education PIP goals.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: NA A/M: 41% of LEAs participated in the 2019 data drill TA meetings.
d. Provide PD and TA to educators on the mathematics <a href="https://achievethecore.org/">Coherence Map</a> (https://achievethecore.org/) and how to use it to scaffold the learning of struggling students.	2015–2019	T: Done and ongoing F: Embedded activities into the PD that demonstrate participants’ understanding and ability to apply the information. A/M: Presented at multiple meetings to educators and parents. See SSIP PD Tracking form in Appendix A.

Implementation Activities (Outputs)	Timeline	Progress
<p>e. Provide instructional coaching to educators using the Coaching Growth Continuum as they implement EBPs and discontinue the use of ineffective practices in mathematics instruction.</p>	<p>2015–2019</p>	<p>T: Done and ongoing  F: NA  A/M: 42 participants had initial training on mathematics content coaching, including guidelines for coaching cycles, role of coach, and utilizing a coaching protocol; implementation included teaching practices, growth mindset, and coaching questions to improve EBPs related to these areas; ineffective practices discussed through lens of instruction that leads to fixed mindset (for example, not letting students communicate or asking only questions that promote memorization/fast answers, therefore silently communicating to a class that “you are smart at math if you memorize” vs “you are smart because you reason and think critically about problems”).</p>

## **B.2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation**

Utah recognizes that in order to adequately and effectively implement the SSIP and improve infrastructure, other state agencies and stakeholders must collaborate with the USBE and LEAs. To that end, the USBE SES and the CDIT have already disseminated and shared detailed information about the SSIP and how stakeholders can collaborate with the USBE to implement and participate in the improvement activities outlined in the Implementation Matrix.

In addition, the Assistant Superintendent of Student Support, the SSIP Specialist, and other CDIT members have been meeting with stakeholders, including other state agencies to support state infrastructure improvements, to solicit feedback regarding SSIP implementation efforts and initial outcomes, elicit support for and help with the SSIP implementation process, and elicit ideas about possible gaps in the improvement activities and implementation process. The CDIT has created products to advertise the SSIP and resources to share with LEAs, and the members have disseminated information and resources to all of the stakeholder groups with which they interact. In addition, CDIT members have requested that representatives from state agencies, organizations, and associations do the same. The continued level of interest and number of questions the USBE has received about implementation activities has been exciting. When asked at meetings and conferences if stakeholders know about the SSIP and/or are participating in implementation activities, the number of individuals who acknowledge awareness has become more than those who don't.

Using the same process Utah successfully employed to solicit stakeholder input and buy-in during Phases I–III, the Assistant Superintendent of Student Support, the SSIP Specialist, and other CDIT members have guided the implementation process by going directly to stakeholder groups instead of just asking for representatives to attend (a) stakeholder meeting(s). By getting on the agenda of already-scheduled meetings of the state agencies and organizations that either pay for, provide, receive, participate in, or collaborate on IDEA services and issues, and/or provide expertise, Utah has now discussed the SSIP with thousands of stakeholders, eliciting ideas about how best to achieve the SIMR. Utah has received and acted upon valuable feedback about SSIP implementation and evaluation and provided valued follow-up information to interested individuals and groups. These discussions have occurred with a wide selection of stakeholders at numerous state, regional, and local meetings, and Utah continues to reach many more stakeholders than would have participated otherwise. To reach stakeholders that either don't have regular meetings or that weren't in attendance when SSIP feedback was discussed, multiple internal and external in-person and written discussions of implementation activities were undertaken. Stakeholders that participated in the discussions include:

- USBE;
- Utah School Boards Association (USBA);
- Utah School Superintendents Association (USSA);
- Utah Association of School Business Officials (UASBO);
- Utah State Charter School Board (USCSB);
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP) ([USEAP membership and roles](https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/partnerships/member)  
[<https://schools.utah.gov/specialeducation/resources/partnerships/member>]);
- Utah LEA Special Education Directors;
- Utah Chapter of the Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE);
- LEA Title I Directors;



LEA Curriculum Directors;  
 LEA Math Coordinators;  
 LEA Secondary Math Leaders;  
 LEA Assessment Directors;  
 LEA Preschool Coordinators;  
 Other LEA staff, as invited by the Special Education Director (e.g., Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent);  
 Utah Middle Level Association (UMLA);  
 UPDN providers and Advisory Board (includes LEA leadership);  
 UPC (Utah's Parent Training and Information Center);  
 Utah Association of School Psychologists (UASP);  
 Utah Education Association (UEA);  
 Utah Parent Teacher Association (PTA);  
 Utah Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC);  
 Utah Speech and Hearing Association (USHA);  
 Utah Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities (CCPD) (members from Utah State agencies, including Vocational Rehabilitation [VR], Department of Health [DOH], Division of Services to Persons with Disabilities [DSPD], and Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind [USDB]);  
 United States Department of Education (USDOE) OSEP;  
 CEEDAR;  
 Utah Partnership for Transforming Educator Preparation (UPTEP);  
 NCSI;  
 Utah Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) Deans of Education;  
 Utah IHE teacher preparation, leadership, school psychology, and mathematics departments;  
 Educators (administrators, general education, and special education teachers);  
 Parents;  
 Paraeducators;  
 Advocates (from Utah's Protection and Advocacy Center and the Legislative Coalition for People with Disabilities (LCPD));  
 Legislators;  
 Utah School Counselors Association;  
 Utah School Social Workers Association;  
 Utah Secondary School Principals Association;  
 Utah Elementary School Principals Association;  
 UCTM;  
 Utah Parent Council (for the Utah Division of Child and Family Services);  
 Hope Street Teacher Fellows; and  
 Community members (included in various committees, associations, boards, and statewide conferences).

These stakeholders have been and will continue to be included in the discussion of SSIP implementation because they are vital to the achievement of Utah's SIMR. Their efforts are valued and integral to implementation of the SSIP, as is their ongoing commitment to continue to work towards improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

## C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

### C.1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan

In order to efficiently and effectively monitor outputs and assess the effectiveness of Utah's SSIP implementation plan, at least one member of the CDIT was assigned to facilitate the implementation of each activity on the Implementation Matrix.

In addition, the SSIP Specialist was assigned to review the Implementation Matrix monthly and track the progress of each activity outlined in the Implementation Matrix. She also keeps a record of all the discussions and presentations about the SSIP that have happened since the last CDIT meeting so that members can review stakeholder feedback and incorporate any ideas or concerns from stakeholders into the planning of the next month's SSIP implementation and evaluation discussion.

Utah is very pleased, and frankly impressed, with the progress the CDIT members are making in facilitating the implementation of the broad Coherent Improvement Strategies and the improvement activities. CDIT members were recruited from all instructional sections of the USBE and have not been given extra time or had other assignments taken off their plates to compensate for their time spent working on SSIP implementation. Each member has agreed to participate and follow through with assignments because he/she believes that the SIMR can and should be achieved and that as mathematics achievement improves for students with disabilities, it will improve for all students.

Utah has seen further indicators that an increased number of stakeholders are supporting the overall belief that mathematics proficiency is a concern worth addressing which needs to be supported by many to make effective change. This past year two things have highlighted this change in belief. First, at the June 2017 Utah PTA Convention, Utah PTA members voted on and passed the resolution "High Expectations for Students with Disabilities." They stated, "With this resolution, Utah PTA hopes to begin to change the mindset of all the stakeholders—parents, teachers, administrators, the community, and the students themselves. Utah PTA supports high expectations for all students and insists that all students, including students with disabilities, should be given the opportunities, tools, resources, accommodations, and instruction to enable them to go as far as possible toward achieving their full potential. We ask for your help in changing the mindset to improve outcomes for our students with disabilities."

The CDIT is continuing to measure the effectiveness of the pilot projects and improvement activities being implemented by the I-9 LEAs through a review of their formative data and then comparing their SIMR results to the SIMR results of the state. This year, a visit was made to Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery to examine the outcomes of their targeted pilot project to improve middle school mathematics proficiency. A review of each district's project and initial data is provided below.

#### ***Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery***

Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery (WCSD) conducted a deep data dive into the mathematics scores differences between their lower school and middle school campuses. The data revealed that there was a drop in scores of the students transitioning to the middle school. Upon further investigation, WCSD determined that the curriculum the middle school was using, College Preparatory Mathematics (CPM), provided student-centered learning strategies and

pedagogy. CPM also allows students to derive logarithms through project-based, authentic learning and provides practice with concepts and procedures over time so that students can work toward mastery. WCSD recognized that its lower school's current math curriculum did not provide the flexibility and depth of material necessary to support the rich tasks that were needed to engage in the rigors of the CPM curriculum in the middle school. WCSD sought out an appropriate mathematics curriculum for the lower school that builds the necessary skills in students for the transition to middle school. The CPM authors recommended that Bridges in Mathematics would be a strong curriculum to support the CPM program.

USBE awarded WCSD an SSIP grant to purchase the Bridges in Mathematics Curriculum and Interventions kits for the lower school. WCSD matched the funds that they received from USBE and partnered with Making Mathematical Reasoning Explicit (MMRE) to provide year-long professional development around rich tasks and pedagogy for their lower school teachers.

The Bridges in Mathematics program along with the professional development has allowed the lower school teachers to focus on developing their students' deep understanding of mathematical concepts, proficiency with key skills, and the ability to solve complex and novel problems. WCSD's philosophy is to teach *all* students mathematics within the general education setting. This allows *all* students access to grade level core content, which is in alignment with the Theory of Action of the SSIP.

WCSD has observed improvement in students' benchmark growth and projected end-of-level achievement based on the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) MAP data. While WCSD has been able to gather only a few data points in the timeframe of implementation of the new Bridges in Mathematics program and the related interventions, early data suggests that the efforts to improve students' mathematics learning have been successful and will continue to build as the school works towards full implementation.

When students finish their MAP growth test, they receive a number called a RIT score for each area they are tested in. This score represents a student's achievement level at any given moment and helps measure their academic growth over time. The RIT scale is a stable scale that accurately measures student performance and shows their growth between test administrations. See the tables below for an example of student RIT scores and growth projection.

### Fall 2017–Fall 2018 WCSD Students Receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 Instruction

NWEA FA17	NWEA WI18	NWEA SP18	NWEA FA18	Growth Projection	Beginning Grade Level	Ending Grade Level	Learning Velocity
230	230	235	238	243	4.7	4.7	0
199	194	205	211	219	4.1	4.2	0.2
218	233	231	230	235	5.6	6.1	1.2
210	216	211	214	220	2.9	3	0.5
182	184	193	192	201	2	2.4	1
NA	211	212	195	201	2.5	3	1
207	216	216	220	225	2.6	2.9	1.4
216	219	221	223	229	N/A	N/A	N/A

## WCSD Middle School Students Receiving Special Education Services for Mathematics

NWEA FA17	NWEA WI18	NWEA SP18	NWEA FA18	Growth Projection
196	214	223	226	231
NA	NA	NA	210	218
213	216	216	223	229
NA	NA	NA	186	195
205	215	212	214	220
184	185	194	193	200
210	209	196	208	213
179	192	200	193	202

USBE is excited about the progress WCSD students are making. The WCSD executive director and assessment director presented the results above to all of the LEA Special Education Directors at the December 2018 meeting. Many LEA Special Education Directors were interested in seeing the RISE assessment data for Spring 2019 to determine if the projected change actually happens and, if it does, if the other LEAs want to consider adopting the same curriculum, professional development and strategies that WCSD has used.

### ***Parent Book Study: Grit by Angela Duckworth***

Again, this year, the USBE partnered with The Utah Parent Center (UPC) to host a Parent Book Study. This year's study was of *GRIT, the Power of Passion and Perseverance*, by Angela Duckworth. The book study consisted of two, three-week discussion sessions. Each session lasted for an hour and was hosted on an online platform. The sessions were held at night from 7:00–8:00 pm which allowed parents time to get home, have dinner, and then participate in the book study.

USBE purchased 300 books and created study notes and discussion questions for the study. Each parent that registered received a packet of discussion materials through the mail. The sessions were capped at 150 participants due to the limitation of the online platform. Both sessions were filled to capacity after two days of open registration.

The intent of the book study was to continue Utah's work to instill high expectations in parents of students with disabilities and other community members/stakeholders. USBE observed over each of the three-week sessions that parents were very active in the discussions both with the moderators and more importantly, with each other. They were giving each other encouragement and shared their own experiences and resources. One of the parents from the book study said, "Reading the books, *Mindset* and *Grit*, have changed my life and how I parent my kids!" This is exactly what USBE was hoping would be the outcome of the book study.

### ***Expectations and Beliefs Survey (Progress survey)***

In 2015, the USBE SES conducted an expectations and beliefs survey to inform our data and infrastructure analyses (Baseline survey) to which 1,532 individuals responded. As outlined in Utah's Phase I and Phase II reports, the survey results showed that Utahans needed to increase their expectations for students with disabilities' growth and achievement. As a result, the CDIT was formed, a Public Relations firm was hired and the USBE began providing comprehensive outreach to stakeholders to help them understand the relationship between expectation and

achievement. Utah has reported each year since that initial survey that through our interactions with stakeholders and their responses to our supports and activities, we believe that expectations have increased, but we planned to resurvey in 2018 to have more definitive data of our progress.

In the Fall of 2018 and the Winter of 2019, the CDIT sent out a similar but slightly edited survey (a couple typos were corrected, and a couple questions were added to inform Utah's general special education program that aren't directly related to the SSIP) to the same groups of stakeholders as the original 2015 Baseline survey to gauge progress. The CDIT was thrilled to have more than twice as many respondents (3,172) to the Progress survey as the original Baseline survey. We believe this dramatic increase in survey response is due to the four years of focused interaction we have had with stakeholders talking about improving mathematics outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

In the Progress survey, 32% of the respondents identified their "primary role" for purposes of the responding to the survey as "parent" while 24% identified themselves as "K12 general educator" and 17% identified themselves as "K12 special educator". Only 1,799 individuals responded to the question of whether their child had an IEP or 504 or not, but of those that responded, 45% reported their student had an IEP or a 504 plan.

The first group of questions in the survey were related to general expectations and beliefs about the growth and proficiency of students with disabilities. Response to the statement, "Students with disabilities should be served in the general education classroom unless their Individualized Education Program (IEP) shows a need for services outside the general curriculum," 88% responded "agree" or "strongly agree," which is nearly identical to the result in the Baseline survey (89%). However, 11% "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" in the Baseline survey and that number decreased to 5.65% in the Progress survey, which demonstrates an exciting improvement since baseline. Utah also saw an increase in the percentage of respondents who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" (87%) with the statement that "students with disabilities should have access to grade-level Utah Core standards," as only 78% responded that way in the Baseline survey. Similarly, 84% of respondents stated that "students with disabilities should receive specialized instruction that supplements, not replaces general education instruction," which is also a huge improvement from baseline (65%). When asked if, "students with disabilities can learn and achieve grade-level Utah Core Standards," only 10% of respondents "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" in the Progress survey which is dramatic improvement from the 26% that felt that way in the Baseline survey.

The second group of questions is specific Utah's SIMR. The first of these questions, "In 2016-17, the Utah State Board of Education reported a 22.2% gap in mathematics proficiency between students without disabilities and students with disabilities. This reported achievement gap is the result of: (Check all that apply)" found that 68% identified "The student's disability" was at least one reason for the gap, which was a disappointingly high percentage. However, 47% also identified "instructional differences" as a reason, 45% reported that "educators' low expectations" was a reason and 35% reported that "parents' low expectation" was a reason. Since respondents could choose more than one response, we cannot say there is only one reason, but we can say that there that more of our stakeholders recognize that instruction

makes a difference and that expectations make a difference, which is a large improvement over baseline.

Another question related to the SIMR, “Utah teachers have the knowledge and skills to teach all students to a level of basic mathematics proficiency” led 45% of Progress survey respondents to “agree” or “strongly agree” which demonstrates regression from the 55% in the Baseline survey. The CDIT is not sure why that percentage decreased but can speculate that as we have been providing information about students’ mathematics outcomes and the lack of achievement, stakeholders have internalized that need for improvement and the gaps that have created that need. Another possibility is that as we reached considerably more stakeholders with the Progress survey than the Baseline survey, more of those who responded this time think this way than those who responded last time. Either way, that question relates directly to Utah’s second Coherent Improvement Strategy, and demonstrates Utah still needs to work on improving educator’s ability to provide high quality mathematics instruction.

Utah is thrilled to report the Progress survey results indicate that expectations increased for students with disabilities! Changing the expectations and beliefs of stakeholders is the first step to convince parents that they should hold their students and the school/LEA accountable for improved outcomes. It is also a key step in convincing educators the need to improve their content knowledge and pedagogy. Both of these findings support Utah’s Theory of Action and the CDIT believes they demonstrate that Utah is on the right track to address the achievement gap identified by the SSIP.

### ***State Monitoring and Measurement***

The CDIT is measuring the effectiveness of the implementation of improvement activities in several ways. The first is an anecdotal analysis of the number of stakeholders who know what the SSIP is and then are participating in one or multiple improvement activities. The USBE is overwhelmed with the statewide interest and participation. Parents, teachers, and administrators are continuing to talk about the need to improve expectations, content knowledge, pedagogy, and tiered systems of supports in mathematics. They are challenging each other’s mindsets during meetings so that CDIT members no longer have to fulfill that role alone. They are also asking for more resources and more PD about EBPs as well as sharing the video the CDIT made about Utah’s implementation of the SSIP which can be found on CDIT’s [landing page](#).

The CDIT is measuring the effectiveness of PD activities using the USBE SES’s online tool for PD registration and evaluation, Professional Development-Results Improvements and Outcomes (PD-RIO) and the new USBE MIDAS online PD registration, tracking, and evaluation system. Each time the USBE SES or the UPDN provides PD, participants are sent a survey that measures satisfaction and perceptions of knowledge and/or skill gain as a result of attendance. Participants respond to the same seven questions after every PD experience, but providers can also add questions that relate to their specific PD experience if they choose to do so. The CDIT has been able to review survey data from all of the universal and targeted activities that were provided in FFY2017. The vast majority of survey responses have informed the CDIT that the PD activities provided are 1) of high quality, 2) meeting a need, and 3) appreciated. However, the CDIT has also altered several PD activities slightly and added other activities to respond to requests, needs, and feedback provided through survey responses.

The CDIT was measuring the effectiveness of the pilot projects and improvement activities being implemented by the intensive and targeted LEAs but realized that after almost four years of implementation, all LEAs are participating in the PD/TA provided and there's too much cross-pollination of activities to say that data disaggregated by the intensive and targeted LEAs and then compared to the rest of the state demonstrates actual change since there are no longer distinct groups of LEAs who have participated and those who have not. In response to that knowledge, the CDIT, in collaboration with other stakeholder groups including the LEA Special Education Directors, have decided to no longer compare the results of the intensive and targeted LEAs to the rest of the state.

Instead, the CDIT is measuring the effectiveness of all the implementation activities by measuring the progress being made on the continually relevant Evaluation Questions and the objectives in the Evaluation Matrix. (See section A.4. above, as two Evaluation Questions are no longer relevant and will be deleted in future versions of the SSIP.) The CDIT reviewed the baseline data on each relevant Evaluation Question and each objective in the Evaluation Matrix for FFY2014. In late 2018, the CDIT Data and Outcomes committee reviewed all the available data for determining the effectiveness of the SSIP implementation. In January of 2019, the CDIT compared the FFY2016 results with the baseline data. Questions about how the data were coded and aggregated were discussed as well as ideas about how to better display the data to ensure stakeholders can quickly understand it. Overall, the CDIT was pleased that once again students with disabilities made progress on the SAGE mathematics test but was disappointed that Utah did not meet the SIMR target.

## **C.2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary**

Utah has demonstrated progress by providing an overview of how each of the improvement activities for each of the three Coherent Improvement Strategies has been implemented during FFY2016. The Implementation Matrix Progress chart is included in Section B.1. An overview of the progress made to answer each of the Evaluation Questions and the Evaluation Matrix Progress chart is provided in Section E.1.

All data analyses are aligned with objectives and are appropriate for assessing progress towards achieving intended improvements and outcomes. As mentioned previously, counts are used when the denominator (total sample or population) fluctuates or is challenging to determine.

The CDIT reviews the progress made on each activity in the Implementation Matrix as well as the stakeholder feedback received from activity evaluation surveys and evaluation data that are available during monthly meetings and continues to agree that Utah's Theory of Action and Coherent Improvement Strategies are appropriate to achieve the SIMR. Each of the three Coherent Improvement Strategies is tied to a root cause, and the data collected to measure progress is tightly linked to the three Coherent Improvement Strategies and measurable short-term objectives.

No changes have been made to initial implementation/improvement strategies. During FFY2017, the USBE completed two activities as described in Section B.1.

### C.3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation

The USBE recognizes that in order to adequately evaluate the SSIP and make course corrections as a result of evaluation data, other agencies and stakeholders must participate with the USBE and LEAs. To that end, the USBE Assistant Superintendent of Student Support, SSIP Specialist and other CDIT members have been meeting with stakeholders to share the progress of SSIP implementation and initial outcomes.

Using the same process Utah successfully employed to solicit stakeholder input and buy-in during Phases I and II of the SSIP, the USBE Assistant Superintendent of Student Support, SSIP Specialist and other CDIT members have shared the Evaluation Questions and Evaluation Matrix by going to stakeholder groups instead of just asking for representatives to attend (a) stakeholder meeting(s). By getting on the agenda of already-scheduled meetings of the agencies and organizations that either pay for, provide, receive, participate in, or collaborate on IDEA services and issues, and/or provide expertise, Utah is able to discuss with thousands of stakeholders how best to achieve the SIMR and receive valuable feedback about evaluation of the SSIP, including continuing outcome data. These discussions have and will continue to occur with a wide selection of stakeholders at numerous state meetings and statewide conferences. Further, to reach stakeholders that either don't have regular meetings or that weren't in attendance when SSIP feedback was discussed, multiple internal and external in-person and written discussions of evaluation activities were undertaken.

The Evaluation Questions represent the key measurable questions and thus objectives Utah stakeholders have identified and want answered as a result of SSIP implementation. In addition to the objectives detailed in the Evaluation Matrix, the USBE shares information about specific projects and/or activities that are successful, the barriers to implementation of EBPs, and even implementation failures, if there are any. (As stated earlier, the CDIT in collaboration with other stakeholders determined the two of the Evaluation Questions were no longer relevant to the evaluation of the SSIP and Utah has thus discontinued their use.) Obviously, the process Utah is using to gather stakeholder feedback is ensuring that stakeholders have the opportunity to judge the acceptability of activities and outcomes. Stakeholders that have participated in the discussions include:

- USBE;
- USBA
- USSA;
- UASBO;
- USCSB;
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP) ([USEAP membership and roles](#))
- Utah LEA Special Education Directors;
- Utah CASE;
- LEA Title I Directors;
- LEA Curriculum Directors;
- LEA Math Coordinators;
- LEA Secondary Math Leaders;
- LEA Assessment Directors;
- LEA Preschool Coordinators;



Other LEA staff, as invited by the Special Education Director (e.g., Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent);

UMLA;

UPDN providers and Advisory Board (includes LEA leadership);

UPC

UASP;

UEA;

PTA;

Utah CEC;

USHA;

Utah CCPD (members from Utah State agencies, including VR, DOH, DSPD, and USDB);

USDOE OSEP;

CEEDAR;

UPTEP;

NCSI;

Utah IHE Deans of Education;

Utah IHE teacher preparation, leadership, school psychology, and mathematics departments;

Educators (administrators, general education, and special education teachers);

Parents;

Paraeducators;

Advocates (from Utah's Protection and Advocacy Center and LCPD);

Legislators;

Utah School Counselors Association;

Utah School Social Workers Association;

Utah Secondary School Principals Association;

Utah Elementary School Principals Association;

UCTM;

Utah Parent Council (for the Utah Division of Child and Family Services);

Hope Street Teachers Fellows; and

Community members (included in various committees, associations, boards, and statewide conferences).

These stakeholders have been and will continue to be included in the discussion of SSIP evaluation because they are vital to the achievement of Utah's SIMR. Their efforts are valued and integral to evaluation of the SSIP, as is their ongoing commitment to continue to work towards improving outcomes for student with disabilities.

## D. Data Quality Issues

### **D.1. Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR due to quality of the evaluation data**

Accurate, relevant, and timely data can inform policy makers, stakeholders, and educators in setting goals, targeting interventions, identifying strengths, establishing policy, and monitoring progress. Accurate, relevant, and timely data require that the appropriate people have access to the data they need when they need it and know how to effectively and accurately report the data. Data access must also be balanced by privacy concerns and proper data use.

USBE has developed a data governance structure based on proven data governance practices and educational data needs. The USBE data governance structure centers on the idea that data are the responsibility of all USBE sections, and that data-supported decision making is the goal of all data collection, storage, reporting, and analysis. Data-supported decision-making guides what data are collected, reported, and analyzed.

While data governance works best when all employees take an interest in data and data issues, specific individuals are assigned to guide and facilitate proper data use. Each section at USBE assigns at least one data steward to oversee how data specific to that section are defined, collected, stored, shared, and reported. Data do not exist in a vacuum but are only properly used within context. While the USBE Data and Statistics section and Information Technology section staff have knowledge about data, analysis, and data systems, they lack the contextual knowledge needed to make policy decisions about the collection and use of data. Good data management requires both an understanding of the data and an understanding of the program or context. Thus, USBE section-based data stewards function as liaisons and bridge the gap that sometimes exists between “data experts” and “program experts.” Data meetings foster collaboration among the USBE sections and between the USBE and LEAs. It is important that all data be collected once, have one source system of record, and be shared among all that are authorized and have a need for the data. Reported data should meet the standards of reliability and validity and adhere to established quality control processes. Finally, interpretation and use of reported data should be appropriate to the definitions, the collection, and educational theory surrounding the data.

Over the past several years, Utah invested considerable effort to improve the accuracy and reliability of data. USBE has implemented the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) in order to facilitate quality reporting of student data and transfer of information between USBE and LEAs. Data are submitted from the LEAs to USBE on a daily basis. This ensures a continual review of data so that LEA staff can make ongoing corrections as needed. Further, USBE requires three distinct submissions which allow for a “snapshot” of enrollment at a particular time. For these three submissions, USBE staff conduct general reviews of the data and provide timely feedback to LEAs so that corrections can be made before the data are considered final. These reviews are designed to catch major problems, such as the omission of large groups of students from the reporting. If necessary, USBE does have policies and procedures in place for LEAs to request the correction of previously submitted data. This review is provided by the USBE Data and Statistics section, and submissions are reviewed by each data steward for the identification of potential program-specific errors.

SSIP data sources (students, parents, general or special education teachers, LEA Special Education Directors, and other LEA staff) for each key measure are described. For example, there were 142 LEAs in FFY2014, 146 in FFY2015, 150 in FFY2016, and 154 in FFY2017, and each has an LEA Special Education Director, so the percentage of respondents or those served is available. The number of students with disabilities in the state is known, though numbers may fluctuate slightly, so the percentages of students assessed or proficient on assessments is accurate within a small margin of error due to enrollment or classification fluctuations. However, in some cases, the population or sample size might help with interpretation of data but is not easily identified. For example, response rates for surveys are often not included as the total number (population) of parents and/or educators who are available to respond to a survey is challenging to determine. Though the number (or percentage) of LEAs with representation at trainings or meetings relevant to the SSIP are reported, the number of people (or percentage) representing each district is not, as the denominator (population of interest) can be challenging to determine and increases complexity in reporting and interpreting.

The key baseline data for the SIMR is the percent of students who are proficient on the SAGE end-of-level statewide mathematics assessment. Those data were used for the SSIP Phase I data analysis and subsequent reporting. Other baseline data for key measures are described in the Evaluation Matrix Progress chart. Some cells in the chart include “NA” for baseline data as implementation of activities did not begin in the first year of the SSIP.

The SAGE assessments are administered in the spring of each school year. Other data (i.e., survey and count of participants from trainings, formative assessment data, etc.) are collected as implemented or on an on-going basis and analyzed as needed to determine progress towards goals. Because the SIMR is the key metric, and it is based on the state’s SAGE assessment, Utah is confident in the quality of data upon which the SIMR is based.

Because LEAs develop or select their own benchmarks for formative assessment and measuring fidelity of implementation, Utah will continue to provide guidance on assessing the reliability and validity of these measures and interpreting findings, particularly if the outcomes reported by districts using these measures do not correlate with the SAGE. To date, this has not been an issue, and Utah will address the discrepancies with individual LEAs as they arise. It is less likely that these measures will be assessed for reliability of data, so Utah will not know the extent to which they provide reliable data and accurately measure the constructs they target. Formative evaluation findings based on these potentially less reliable measures will be tempered accordingly. However, given the focus on the SIMR and SAGE results, Utah is confident that our summative conclusions are valid and will remain the key target.

All students with disabilities enrolled in public schools are included in the sample used for SSIP reporting. All LEAs (districts and charter schools) are included in SSIP reporting. Hence, sampling procedures are not necessary for data aggregated at these levels. Districts vary in their rules for allowing access to teachers and parents. For example, one large school district’s negotiated agreement only allows surveys approved by the union to be administered to teachers, so that district is typically excluded from teacher surveys but included when teachers attend USBE trainings. Given Utah’s focus on local control, districts report other aggregated data (i.e., formative assessments, implementation fidelity using district created/selected instrumentation) and sample selection procedures to the USBE, and these samples and procedures may vary across LEAs.

The data used to measure the number of teachers who have the Special Education Mathematics Endorsements are taken from the USBE licensing database, the Comprehensive Administration of Credentials for Teachers in Utah Schools (CACTUS) and are an accurate reflection of the number of teachers who have valid educator licenses and Special Education Mathematics Endorsements attached to those licenses.

The data used to measure the number of students who took the ACT test in eleventh grade and also who achieved a Utah college-ready score of 18 on the ACT come from an ACT download. The student identification numbers attached to each ACT score are then cross-referenced with the Utah EdFacts submission of child count data to determine how many of the students who took and passed the ACT test were students with disabilities. Utah's data sharing agreement with ACT ensures that the data are accurate and secure.

Data are informing next steps in SSIP implementation. For example, attendance by LEA Special Education Directors at the data drill in March 2019 was higher than March 2018, which was unexpectedly lower than in March 2017 demonstrating that as Utah receives feedback from LEAs, we are course-correcting to improve relevance, interest and attendance. And since the majority (90%) of LEAs included a mathematics goal in their annual special education PIP, it's obvious that previous data drill and SSIP dissemination work has created an increased awareness of and focus on students with disabilities and mathematics.

Given our data analyses and interim outcomes, Utah feels confident we can defend the claim that the SSIP is on the right path. Utah will continue to analyze data, monitor progress, and make adjustments to implementation as needed to attain the SIMR. Because Utah is concerned about the trend of parents opting their students out of taking the SAGE assessment, Utah is currently analyzing growth data to determine if a measure of growth would be a more appropriate target than a measure of proficiency. Utah will be administering two new statewide assessments in 2019, the RISE for grades 3-8 and the Utah Aspire Plus for grades 9-10, so though Utah is not proposing to change its SIMR at this point in the analysis process Utah will likely request an amendment to its SIMR baseline data and targets next year based on the new standards set by the two new statewide assessments.

## E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

### E.1. Assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements

As reported in Utah's SSP/APR Indicator 3, students with disabilities in grades three through eight had a mathematics baseline in FFY2013 of 20.11%, which decreased in FFY2014 to 17.06%, then increased by 0.55 to 17.61% in FFY2015. Scores again increased for this age group in FFY2016 to 17.90% and in FFY2017 to 18.40%. In grade 10, Utah had a mathematics proficiency baseline in FFY2013 of 7.86%, with decreases in FFY2014 to 7.15%, in FFY2015 to 7.08% and in FFY2016 to 6.50%. Proficiency had a slight rebound in FFY2017 to 6.60%, but still has not reached FFY2013 levels. As proficiency in grades three through eight is increasing but proficiency in grade 10 is not, it appears from these initial results that by focusing on middle school mathematics, Utah's SSIP is having a positive impact on proficiency. It appears, however, that the impact is not being sustained into the higher grades.




Figure 5: Math proficiency on SAGE and DLM for students with disabilities in grades 3–8 and 10 as reported on Indicator 3 for FFY2013-2017.

In further analyzing this data, the decrease in participation rate was examined. Historically, Utah has had high participation rates. At the same time as Utah introduced the SAGE statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. The law was further clarified in FFY2015, allowing parents to exclude their children from "any assessment" that is mandated on a state or federal level. As a result, these opt outs have added to the decrease in participation rates. Other factors that are included in non-participation include absence on test date, taking a below grade level test, refusing to test, or taking a modified test.

The data in the graph below are the numbers of students that did not participate due to parental opt-out and include all grades. FFY2017 marks a change in the trend in that the opt-out has not increased further but has decreased. One possible explanation is a decision by the USBE to not require 11<sup>th</sup> graders to participate in SAGE testing and instead only participate in

the ACT. Another possibility is increased PD/TA about giving parents more information about the importance of the SAGE test and how the scores are used to guide instruction.




Figure 6: Percentage of students whose parents have opted out of taking the SAGE for both general education students and students with disabilities

Even though the number has decreased, an analysis of the characteristics of students who are opting out of the SAGE continues to indicate that a larger proportion of students who have previously been proficient have opted out of taking the SAGE than students who have previously been non-proficient. Because Utah is concerned that this trend of nonparticipation will continue and could even increase, Utah is currently calculating median growth percentile and target data and providing them to LEAs to determine if students in their LEA are showing growth even if they have not met proficiency.

As a subset of the Indicator 3 grades three through eight target the SIMR includes students with disabilities in grades 6–8 with the classification of SLD and SLI. Baseline data from FFY2013 indicated Utah’s overall proficiency rate was 7.10%. We saw an increase for FFY2014 to 8.70% for the state, and additional increase in FFY2015 to 9.90%. FFY2016 data indicated decrease to 9.80% for Utah’s overall SIMR proficiency. Excitingly, FFY2017 saw an increase to 10.00% proficiency which is a 2.90% increase since the baseline data.




Figure 7: Results of the SIMR for all students with disabilities in Utah for FFY2013–2017.

Utah also made progress in achieving most of the short-term objectives in the Evaluation Matrix which was created in Phase II of the SSIP to answer the Evaluation Questions. Each of the Evaluation Questions is briefly addressed below and then in the Evaluation Matrix Progress chart. The Evaluation Matrix Progress chart also demonstrates Utah’s progress on each of the short-term objectives used to answer the Evaluation Questions. As mentioned earlier, two of the Evaluation Questions have been determined to no longer be relevant to the evaluation of the SSIP. They are included here for ease of the review of the SSIP but will not be included in next year’s report.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy I, High Expectations and Beliefs, Evaluation Question One:**

Did the SSIP implementation activities related to high expectations and beliefs increase the percentage of educators and parents who believe students with disabilities can master grade-level content?

Utah surveyed stakeholders during 2018 to determine if expectations and beliefs have improved since the baseline survey was administered in the fall of 2015. The Progress survey is review in section C.1. 3,172 respondents demonstrated that Utah has increased expectations for the outcomes for students with disabilities during the 4 years of implementation of the SSIP.


Utah is thrilled to report the Progress survey results indicate that expectations increased for students with disabilities! Changing the expectations and beliefs of stakeholders is the first step to convince parents that they should hold their students and the school/LEA accountable for improved outcomes. It is also a key step in convincing educators the need to improve their content knowledge and pedagogy. Both of these findings supports Utah’s Theory of Action and the CDIT believes they demonstrate that Utah is on the right track to address the achievement gap identified by the SSIP.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy I, High Expectations and Beliefs, Evaluation Question Two:**

Did the USBE data drill activities result in LEA improvement plans designed to address the improvement of mathematics proficiency of students with disabilities?

The USBE has now successfully conducted data drill activities for five years (February and March of 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019). 41% of LEAs were represented at data drill activities this year (Spring 2019). For 2019, data drill activities were changed due to feedback from previous years. The format was changed from half day to full day, with

the morning spent doing more in-depth training about each indicator and the afternoon spent with LEAs doing activities regarding their actual data. Feedback from this year was positive about the new format. 90% of LEAs wrote goals in the special education PIPs addressing mathematics this year, demonstrating that LEAs are prioritizing math proficiency for students with disabilities.



**Coherent Improvement Strategy I, High Expectations and Beliefs, Evaluation Question Three:**

Did SSIP implementation activities related to high expectation and beliefs increase the number of students with disabilities participating in the ACT test?

In FFY2017, participation in the ACT by students with disabilities in eleventh grade decreased slightly from FFY 2016 to 65.0% but increased slightly for students classified as SLI and SLD in Utah to 73.8%. Both are higher than the baseline year FFY 014 for a total of 2,980 or 62.5% of all students with disabilities and 70.8% of students classified as SLI and SLD in eleventh grade students participating in the ACT.

*Figure 8: Percentage of students with disabilities who participated in taking the ACT in 2014–2015, 2015–2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-18 for (a) all students with disabilities enrolled in Utah schools, (b) all students with SLI or SLD classifications enrolled in Utah schools.*

**Coherent Improvement Strategy I, High Expectations and Beliefs, Evaluation Question Four:**

Did the implementation of the CDIT at the USBE result in infrastructure alignment and improvement and movement along the Collaboration Continuum?

During the infrastructure analysis done for Phase I of the SSIP, the USBE staff agreed that cross-department work was limited to specific projects and specific specialists. When asked to determine where along the Collaboration Continuum staff felt USBE efforts fell, there was consensus that most USBE work was happening at the Contact level but that a few efforts had moved into the Cooperation Level. Since the formation of the CDIT, which has successfully created resources, reviewed data, planned and



provided PD and TA, the USBE has initiated other cross-department efforts to work on creating a comprehensive tiered system of supports that the USBE will provide for LEAs. As a result, USBE administration and the majority of the instructional staff agree that the USBE has moved on the Collaboration Continuum and is consistently operating at the Collaboration Level. This shift demonstrates significant growth for the USBE and the efforts of the CDIT as well as other cross-department work are expected to continue the infrastructure growth toward Convergence.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy II, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Evaluation**

**Question One:** Did the SSIP implementation activities related to content knowledge and effective instruction result in an increase in the number of special education teachers qualified to teach mathematics in secondary settings?

Utah is disappointed to report that the numbers of special education teachers with Mathematics Endorsements has again decreased since the baseline year. In FFY2014, the number was 495 of 4,444, or 11.14%, in FFY2015, the number was 466 of 4,397, or 10.60% and for FFY2016 the number was 436 of 4,229, or 10.32%. FFY2017 data indicates there are 408 special education teachers with math endorsements out of 4,325 special education teachers licensed in the state or 9.40%. Utah will continue to seek ways to increase the number and percentage of special educators who have a mathematics endorsement.




Figure 9: Percentage of special education teachers with mathematics endorsements in Utah.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy II, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Evaluation**

**Question Two:** Did the SSIP implementation activities increase the number of teachers who have been trained on EBPs for mathematics instruction?

The USBE has provided universal, targeted, and intensive supports to LEAs. The universal supports include online books studies, online webinars, online courses, online modules, and in-person workshops and discussions, as well as sessions at numerous

conferences, that introduce, help staff practice and scale up, and provide coaching for EBPs. Utah is thrilled with the interest and participation of educators across the state in these professional learning opportunities as the numbers of teachers who have been trained on EPBs for mathematics increases each month. The percentage of LEAs who participated in those experiences is nearing 100%. All districts and nearly all charter schools participated in some way in the past year. Utah is thrilled that the need to improve mathematics instruction has become a common goal across the state.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy II, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Evaluation**

**Question Three:** Did Utah’s participation in the CEEDAR and CCSSO’s NTEP projects result in increased access to mathematics coursework by special education preservice teachers?

CCSSO’s NTEP work has finished and Utah is participating in CEEDAR 2.0 but is no longer focusing the work on mathematics, so this question is no longer relevant to the SSIP.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy II, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, Evaluation**

**Question Four:** Was the scaling up of I-9 LEA SSIP pilot projects successful in increasing the assessment results of LEAs who adopted the projects?

The CDIT, in collaboration with other stakeholder groups has determined that since nearly all LEAs are now participating in universal activities, supports disaggregating the data by the LEAs who began intensive mathematics improvements projects is no longer a valid measure of progress. Thus, this evaluation question is no longer relevant to the SSIP.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy III, MTSS in Secondary Settings, Evaluation Question One:**

Did the SSIP implementation activities related to MTSS in secondary settings increase the numbers of teachers who have been trained on EBPs for mathematics instruction?

As mentioned in an earlier Evaluation Question, the USBE has provided universal, targeted, and intensive supports to LEAs. The universal supports include online books studies, online webinars, online courses, online modules, and in-person workshops and discussions, as well as sessions at numerous conferences, that introduce, help staff practice and scale up, and provide coaching for EBPs. Utah is thrilled with the interest and participation of educators across the state in these professional learning opportunities as the numbers of teachers who have been trained on EPBs for mathematics increases each month. The percentage of LEAs who participated in those experiences was 100% of districts about 90% of charter schools (this percentage is not definitive because several charter schools closed this past, several opened this past year and many teachers transferred from one charter to another, making it very difficult to determine an accurate percentage.)

Further, the USBE finished the MTSS in Mathematics documents and has disseminated more than 1000 copies statewide.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy III, MTSS in Secondary Settings, Evaluation Question Two:**

Did SSIP implementation activities related to intervention within an MTSS in secondary settings increase the number of students with disabilities who achieved a Utah-college ready score on the mathematics section of the ACT?

As noted above, numbers of students with disabilities participating in the ACT significantly increased from FFY2014 to FFY2015 but leveled off after FFY2016. Along with this increase was a significant increase in students with disabilities achieving benchmark for that same period with the percentage remaining the same between FFY2016 and FFY2017. As hoped, for FFY2017, Utah has again seen a significant increase as middle school students who participated in pilot projects or who had teachers that participated in PD have entered eleventh grade. Though the focus of SSIP implementation and the SIMR focuses on middle school mathematics, Utah’s overall goal for all students with disabilities is that they will graduate from high school and be ready for college, career and independent living. Increasing the number of students with disabilities who take the ACT and who receive a college ready score brings Utah closer to accomplishing that overarching goal.




Figure 10: Percentage of students with disabilities who achieved an ACT score of 18 or higher by eleventh grade.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy III, MTSS in Secondary Settings, Evaluation Question Three:**

Was the scaling up of intensive and targeted LEA SSIP pilot projects successful in increasing the assessment results of LEAs who adopted the projects?

Results from SAGE proficiencies for those in the SIMR group have not increased at the rate expected. While interim, benchmark and/or formative assessment data from LEA pilot projects have shown increases (such as the outlined WCSD data in Section C.1.), these increases have not moved students with disabilities from non-proficient to proficient status. It is difficult to ascertain if this is due to the decrease in participation due to the parent opt-out legislation, if move in proficiency is not sensitive enough to capture growth in students with disabilities, or if too few students with disabilities have participated in the pilot projects to make substantial improvement in statewide proficiency percentages.

After reviewing progress toward each relevant Evaluation Question, Utah is confident that interim findings and formative measures provide an adequate indication of progress. Because of the issues identified earlier, Utah is slightly less confident that as a summative measure, the

SIMR based on the SAGE remains the key indicator of progress. However, since Utah is changing assessments in 2019 to the RISE and Utah Aspire Plus, it doesn't make sense to make any changes to the SIMR this reporting year. Utah anticipates making changes next year to baseline and SIMR targets. To date, Utah is pleased with overall improvements in the SIMR, particularly given the activities implemented across time as we strive to attain full implementation of the SSIP.

Utah's progress achieving the short- and long-term objectives related to the relevant Evaluation Questions is outlined in the Evaluation Matrix Progress chart below. (For brevity, students with disabilities is abbreviated as SWD in the chart.)

**SIMR: Increase the number of students with SLI or SLD in grades 6–8 who are proficient on the SAGE by 11.11% over five years**  
**2013–2014 Baseline: 7.10% proficient**

Year	2014–2015	2015–2016	2016–2017	2017–2018	2018–2019
<b>Target</b>	9.32%	11.54%	13.76%	15.98%	18.20%
<b>Actual</b>	8.70%	9.90%	9.80%	10.0%	N/A

**Evaluation Matrix Progress Chart**  
**Coherent Improvement Strategy I: High Expectations and Beliefs**

Inclusion in grade-level Core, assessment, graduation requirements, and CCR Plans; leadership; preservice and in-service professional learning; data and EBPs; active engagement of all school personnel; IEP team decisions; and fiscal supports.

<b>Measurable Short-Term Objectives 2015–2017</b>	<b>Data to Collect 2015–2017</b>	<b>Baseline Data 2014–2015</b>	<b>Progress 2017–2018</b>
Increase the percentage of educators and parents who believe SWD can master grade-level mathematics content by 10%	Stakeholder Beliefs/ Expectations survey	<p>Of 1,401 respondents, 73.99% agree or strongly agree that SWD can master grade-level content</p> <p>Of 1,401 respondents, 13.06% believe SWD can master 90%+ of grade-level content; 34.76% believe SWD can master 70–89%; 34.40% believe SWD can master 40–69%; 14.78% believe SWD can master 10–39%</p>	<p>Of 3,172 respondents, 84% stated that “students with disabilities should receive specialized instruction that supplements, not replaces general education instruction,” which is also a huge improvement from baseline (65%). When asked if, “students with disabilities can learn and achieve grade-level Utah Core Standards,” only 10% of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” which is dramatic improvement from the 26% in the Baseline survey.</p> <p>“Utah teachers have the knowledge and skills to teach all students to a level of basic mathematics proficiency” led 45% of Progress survey respondents to “agree” or “strongly agree” which demonstrates regression from the 55% in the Baseline survey.</p>
Decrease the number of SWD who are taking off-level mathematics courses and assessments by 20%	SAGE tests and course codes	3,293 SWD or 4.48%	4,011 SWD or 4.89%

<b>Measurable Short-Term Objectives 2015–2017</b>	<b>Data to Collect 2015–2017</b>	<b>Baseline Data 2014–2015</b>	<b>Progress 2017–2018</b>
Presentations given by any CDIT members, any SES members, and USBE administration will include information, data, and or slides created by the CDIT regarding the SSIP in all presentations having a focus on student outcomes	Survey CDIT and administrative staff to determine percentage of presentations that include SSIP-related info	Approximately 20% of the presentations included information about the SSIP	Approximately 30% of the presentations included information about the SSIP
75% of LEA Special Education Directors will attend a data drill	Attendance logs of data drills	66% of LEA Special Education Directors participated in a data drill in March of 2016	41% of LEA Special Education Directors participated in a data drill in February of 2019
50% of LEAs that don't meet state mathematics proficiency targets will include mathematics goals in annual special education PIP	Percentage of special education PIPs that include mathematics goals	N/A	90% of LEAs included a mathematics proficiency goal in their annual special education PIP

**Evaluation Matrix Progress Chart**  
**Coherent Improvement Strategy II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction**

Mathematics content and pedagogy to provide effective instruction through UDL and evidence-based interventions; leadership; preservice and in-service professional learning; data and EBPs; active engagement of all school personnel; IEP team decisions; and fiscal supports.

Measurable Short-Term Objectives 2015–2017	Data to Collect 2015–2017	Baseline Data 2014–2015	Progress 2017–2018
Increase the number of highly qualified/state qualified (HQ) special education teachers by 10%	Number of special education teachers recorded in CACTUS as HQ in mathematics	495 of 4,444 or 11.14%	408 of 4,325 or 9.4%
Increase the number of special education and general education teams trained to coteach providing Core mathematics to SWD by 20 teams	Count of teams who finish a coteaching professional learning cohort	N/A	Eight new coteaching teams (consisting of a general educator and a special educator) received yearlong professional development on coteaching using mathematics content; 11 teams continued for a second year of coteaching training.
50% of the LEAs in Utah will participate in PD on effective mathematics instruction, including EBPs	Number of LEAs recorded in PD-RIO as participating in PD	42% of LEAs participated in mathematics PD	100% of districts and about 90% of charter schools participated in PD.
Common formative or benchmark assessments administered by I-9 LEAs to evaluate their pilot projects will show SWD who received instruction using EBPs are more successful than SWD who don't	I-9 LEAs' common formative assessment or benchmark data	N/A	Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery Data is detailed in Section C.1.

### Evaluation Matrix Progress Chart

#### Coherent Improvement Strategy III: Multi-Tiered Systems of Support in Secondary Settings

Infrastructure, scale, and fidelity; leadership; preservice and in-service professional learning; data and EBPs; active engagement of all school personnel; IEP team decisions; and fiscal supports.

Measurable Short-Term Objectives 2015–2017	Data to Collect 2015–2017	Baseline Data 2014–2015	Progress 2017–2018
Provide secondary general and special education teachers from 15% of the LEAs in Utah with PD on evidence-based effective Tier II and Tier III mathematics interventions	Number of LEAs recorded in PD-RIO or MIDAS as participating in PD	42% of LEAs participated in PD	100% of districts and about 90% of charter schools participated in PD.
Common formative assessments or benchmark assessments administered by I-9 LEAs to evaluate their pilot projects will show SWD who received evidence-based tier II and tier III interventions are more successful than SWD who don't	I-9 LEAs' common formative assessment or benchmark data	N/A	Weilenmann Charter School of Discovery Data is detailed in Section C.1.



## F. Plans for Next Year

### F.1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline

Utah has not added any new activities to be implemented in FFY2018. Utah will continue working on all the activities outlined in the Implementation Matrix.

### F.2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes

During FFY2018, Utah is and will continue to use the evaluation plan outlined in Phase II of the SSIP and described in Section C.1. above. The CDIT will continue to review all outputs and outcomes and make course corrections, if needed. Stakeholders will continue to be provided with data about outputs and outcomes so that their feedback can continue to contribute to the continuous feedback loop needed to successfully implement and evaluate the SSIP.

### F.3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers

There are several significant barriers that Utah is experiencing in implementing the SSIP. The first, described earlier in the Evaluation Questions, is that though Utah is committed to increasing the number of special education teachers who have Mathematics Endorsements, Utah is struggling to find Utah IHE coursework that teachers can take after their school days or that does not require teachers become matriculated students of the universities. The USBE has been actively seeking other ways to provide teachers with the content knowledge and effective instruction information and skills they need to improve the mathematics proficiency of students with disabilities and is now working with two of the four Regional Resource Centers in Utah to provide on-site coursework for the Mathematics Endorsement.

Another barrier to SSIP implementation is the initiative overload that LEAs are currently experiencing. LEAs are involved in multiple improvement initiatives, either because they are low-performing in some area and are required by Federal and or state law to participate, or because they have opted in to the initiative to receive extra fiscal or other support to address an area of need in their LEA continuous improvement plans. Utah LEAs are strapped financially and take every opportunity to acquire additional funds, even when it means creating new plans and writing new reports that may or may not align with all the other plans and reports for which they are responsible. The end result of this initiative overload is that administrators, teachers, and other staff may not have the time or energy to add more professional learning or implement new activities in their LEAs, schools, and classrooms. LEA administrators have reported to the USBE SES and the CDIT numerous times that they would love to participate in SSIP improvement activities, but they simply don't have the time to administer them and/or the funding to pay teachers to implement such activities. The USBE will continue to actively seek ways to increase the time and funding available for LEAs to provide teachers with professional learning opportunities and implement EBPs.

In the Spring of 2019, Utah will be administering two new end-of-level statewide assessments, the RISE for grades 3-8 and the Utah Aspire Plus for grades 9-10 so Utah anticipates having to change SIMR baseline data and targets in the FFY2019 SSIP report which will be barrier to demonstrating trend data over all the years of SSIP implementation.

Another barrier is the limited research on EBPs in mathematics instruction for students who are struggling with learning, especially students with disabilities. Utah identified this barrier in

Phase II of the SSIP and continues to struggle with finding specific EBPs practices that apply to students with disabilities, especially those in secondary settings. The resources provided by the NCSI, NCII, CEEDAR, and the NCTM have informed the professional learning experiences that Utah has provided during FFY2017 and will continue to do so. Utah has benefitted from the cross-state collaborative work of the NCSI and looks forward to the discussions and events that have already been planned for the remainder of FFY2018 and the beginning of FFY2019. Even though there are few EPBs that apply directly to Utah's SIMR, Utah recognizes that if all LEAs across the state only implement or scale up one new EBP, instruction will improve and so will the mastery and achievement of students with disabilities.

#### **F.4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance**

Utah values the support and technical assistance provide by OSEP. The OSEP state calls/webinars, guidance documents, and Q & A documents have been valuable resources that Utah has referenced while implementing improvement activities and writing this Phase III Year 3 report. Utah would appreciate continued receipt of such resources during the remaining years of SSIP implementation and evaluation.

The TA, PD, networking, and resource-sharing opportunities provided by the NCSI have also been valuable to Utah, especially the work of the State Collaborative on Mathematics and the State Collaborative on Systems Alignment. The National Evaluation Webinars and documents were especially useful and the USBE requests that similar webinars continue throughout the SSIP implementation and evaluation process.

One of the biggest challenges the USBE is facing and anticipates continuing to face in the SSIP implementation is scaling up the use of EPBs within an MTSS and convincing LEAs to stop using practices that are not evidenced-based. The USBE would benefit from the continued support of the NCSI, especially the State Collaborative on Mathematics, and since the USBE is the only state focusing exclusively on middle school mathematics, any resources the NCSI could provide that are specific to Utah's SIMR would be valuable.

OSEP could contribute to Utah's successful implementation of the SSIP by funding research specific to EBPs in secondary mathematics and/or implementing MTSS in a secondary setting. Similarly, OSEP could fund a platform for sharing such research that includes how large, medium, and small LEAs and urban, suburban, and rural LEAs could contextualize research findings to fit their unique demographic and geographic needs while maintaining implementation fidelity.

Another of the biggest challenges is that it takes significant staff resources and time to analyze the outcomes related to the SSIP and write up the results in this report. Many states have chosen to use contract evaluators to do this work, the USBE has chosen to save those resources and do the work in house. As the evaluation of the SSIP is so intensive, USBE staff would prefer to spend time helping LEAs implementing evidence-based practices than writing this report. If OSEP would consider decreasing the evaluation and reporting requirements of the SSIP, Utah would be able to spend more time on implementation.

## Appendix

### Appendix A: SSIP Presentations 2018–2019

Month	Organization Presented to	Presenters	Topic
August	Teach to Lead	Leah Voorhies, Joleigh Honey	MTSS Framework; UMTSS messaging video
July	Utah Rural Schools	Shannon Ference, Whitney Barlow	MTSS Framework
July	STEM Best Practices	Nathan Auck, Todd Call	Ed Tech Best Practices
June	Utah Systems Conference	Kim Baker, Kim Fratto	MTSS Framework; SPDG program measures
June	Utah Systems Conference	Joleigh Honey, Shannon Ference, Becky Unker	MTSS Framework (Critical Components – three sessions and UMTSS messaging video)
August	Granite School District Welcome Back	Joleigh Honey, Nathan Auck	MTSS Framework (Critical Components)
June	Systems Conference	David Smith, Joleigh Honey	Systems Alignment – three sessions
August	State ELA Co-Teaching Cohort	Leslie Evans, Jessica Sitton	SSIP Theory of action – math data relating to ELA
August	Centennial Elementary, Duchesne School District	Shannon Ference	High-quality instruction, progressions
August	Cache School District Co-Teaching Opening Day	Becky Unker	SSIP–importance of SWD having access to grade-level core
September	State Mathematics Coordinator Meeting	Joleigh Honey, Nate Auck, Shannon Ference	MTSS Framework; UMTSS messaging video
September	Guest Lecture in University of Utah SPED Class	Becky Unker	SSIP–importance of SWD having access to grade-level core
October	Utah Council of Teachers of Mathematics (UCTM) Conference	Becky Unker, Shannon Ference, Joleigh Honey	MTSS Framework; UMTSS messaging video
October	Mathematics Coaching Institute	Shannon Ference, Nate Auck, Joleigh Honey	MTSS Framework; UMTSS messaging video
August	Elementary Mathematics Endorsement Revision Committee	Shannon Ference	UMTSS Framework

<b>Month</b>	<b>Organization Presented to</b>	<b>Presenters</b>	<b>Topic</b>
November	MTSS Module Training	Online	MTSS and math
October	School Counselors and Administrators – USBE Training	Holly Todd, Kim Herrera	Math messaging
November	MTSS Fall Training	Kim Baker, Kim Fratto,	MTSS overview; Math MTSS document
Oct	STEM Institute (over 100 admin across state)	Joleigh Honey, Shannon Ferrence, Nate Auck	MTSS Framework; UMTSS messaging video
September	State Mathematics Education Coordinating Committee (SMECC) Meeting	Joleigh Honey, Shannon Ferrence, Nate Auck	MTSS Framework; UMTSS messaging video
January	Alpine School District Elementary Math Committee	Shannon Ferrence	MTSS Framework
November	Utah Special Education Administrators’ Meeting (USEAM)	Leah Voorhies	SSIP LEA project and positive outcomes
January	Sevier School District PD	Shannon Ferrence	MTSS Framework and progressions sessions
December	CCSSO States	Leah Voorhies	Convergence
November	Mathematics Coaching Institute	Shannon Ferrence, Nate Auck, Joleigh Honey	MTSS along with mathematics teaching practices and coaching
January	Title IV Part A Webinar	Joleigh Honey, Kim Herrera	System of Support as a priority option in IV-A
November	Special Education IHEs	Joleigh Honey	Mathematics instruction and endorsement opportunities
November	Title IV Part A – Options in High Leverage Strategies: Mathematics	Joleigh Honey	Title IV Part A
December	Guest Lecturer in Westminster SPED Class	Becky Unker	SSIP–importance of SWD having access to grade-level core
November	State Ed Tech Directors Association (SETDA) Leadership Summit	Todd Call	UMTSS video and website
January	Sevier School District PD	Nate Auck	UMTSS video and website; Framework PL

<b>Month</b>	<b>Organization Presented to</b>	<b>Presenters</b>	<b>Topic</b>
January	Salt Lake School District Elementary Mathematics Endorsement Cohort	Shannon Ferrence	UMTSS on critical components
January	State Mathematics Educators	Joleigh Honey, Shannon Ferrence	UMTSS Mathematics Professional Learning Applications
January	Math Study Session Presentation w/USBE	Nate Auck	UMTSS data/infographic
February	Guest Lecturer in University of Utah Braille Class	Becky Unker	SSIP–math instruction that includes more than the abacus
February	Guest Lecturer in BYU SPED Class	Becky Unker	SSIP–importance of SWD having access to grade-level core