

UT Part B

FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

In FFY 2017, Utah either met or was in significant compliance with 15 of 31 possible targets on the applicable Part B APR indicators. These included indicators measuring dropout, discipline, LRE (ages 6-21), preschool outcomes statement 2 (i.e., functioning within age expectations), preschool environments, preschool skills (A1 and B2), disproportionality, and compliance indicators 11. Academic proficiency for students in special education increased with the exception of 10 grade mathematics. Utah showed growth in preschool indicators but did not meet target in two indicators measuring preschool outcomes (Utah didn't meet three in FFY 2016 demonstrating progress in FFY 2017). Unfortunately, continued implementation of a state law allowing parents to refuse participation in a statewide assessment resulted in a continued decrease in the assessment participation rates of students with disabilities. Indicator 13 shows a decline from FFY 2016 and will continue to be an area of priority in the state. Through an ongoing improvement process, the USBE SES identified that the data reported for Indicator 13 in FFY 2016 was not accurate due to a glitch in our computer program. Our program has been corrected for the FFY 2017. Progress was made on all three indicators of Post-School Outcomes with an increase of 1.95% on target B, although the targets for Indicator 14 were not met.

Utah values the findings of this APR and continues to align efforts and budgets to address those areas most impactful to student outcomes.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

154

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Utah's General Supervision Process

The Utah State Board of Education, Special Education Services (USBE SES) has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities.

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system is called the Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) and is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE staff review of each Local Education Agency's (LEA's) performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier which includes a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified need.

USBE SES's Results-Driven Accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the federal intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process.

UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of SEA support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the state education agency (USBE SES) according to the LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. Methods and procedures used to implement UPIPS are consistent, but flexible, in order to adapt to the individual needs of students, educational settings, and administrative realities.

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

The monitoring system has five major objectives:

- Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on improving academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities by linking LEA data, including APR data, to improvement efforts.
- Ensure compliance with IDEA federal regulations and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules (USBE SER).
- Connect LEA-level and school-level improvement efforts with IDEA and USBE SER requirements.
- Support each school district and charter school in the process of self-assessment, evaluation, and improvement of compliance and program effectiveness.
- Link program improvement activities with long-range, multi-year professional development planning.

The overall system is based on the following underlying principles or themes:

- An effective accountability system is continuous rather than episodic, is linked to systemic change, and integrates self-assessment with continuous feedback and response.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Partnership with stakeholders. The LEA works in partnership with diverse stakeholders. This collaboration affects the following areas: the collection and analysis of self-assessment data; the identification of critical issues and solutions to problems; and the development, implementation, and oversight of improvement strategies to ensure compliance and improved results for students with disabilities.
- LEA accountability. LEAs are accountable for identifying strengths and areas of concern based upon data analysis; identifying, implementing and revising strategies for program improvement; and submitting annual measurement and progress reports.
- Self-Assessment. Each LEA works with stakeholders to design and implement a Self-Assessment process that focuses on improving results for students with disabilities.
- Data-driven process. The improvement process in each LEA is driven by data that focuses on improved results for students with disabilities. Each LEA collects and uses data on an ongoing basis, aligned with both the USBE's and the LEA's performance goals and indicators. Data that are available and can be critical to the Self-Assessment process include APR indicators, personnel needs, graduation and dropout rates, performance of students with disabilities on state- and district-wide assessments, rates at which students with disabilities are suspended and/or expelled from school, and rates of identification and placement of students from minority backgrounds.
- Technical assistance. The focus of the monitoring process is on continuous improvement; therefore technical assistance is a critical component of the process. Key components of technical assistance are the identification and dissemination of evidenced-based practices and promising practices as well as professional development. LEAs are encouraged to include these components as part of their program improvement plan.

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible and generally within one month of discovery. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and USBE SER are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification.

LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In addition, LEAs are required to write a program improvement plan to address their process for ensuring that the regulatory requirements are being implemented correctly throughout the LEA. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of overdue evaluation(s), Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), etc. LEAs whose program improvement plan does not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds.

Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices and the USBE SES verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE SES followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. That includes accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance, requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance, and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, including the correction of noncompliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, based upon the USBE SES's review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Utah has a multi-tiered technical assistance process in place to ensure LEAs can access the information and resources necessary to provide high quality and compliant services to students with disabilities. Using the Results-Driven Accountability process, all LEAs are assigned to a Tier level which designates the type of supports they will receive.

Supporting Tier

LEAs in the Supporting Tier demonstrate successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations and USBE SER,

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional development resources. LEA-specific areas of need/improvement are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) developed by the LEA. A progress report on the PIP is submitted to the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is supported by the USBE SES for LEAs in this tier.

Guiding Tier

LEAs in the Guiding Tier demonstrate successful self-monitoring, high levels of compliance with IDEA regulations and USBE SER, acceptable rates of positive outcomes for students with disabilities, and effective use of professional development resources, but have one or more areas of minor need demonstrated over a single year. USBE SES and LEA-identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA with guidance from the SES. A progress report on the PIP is submitted to the RDA Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is guided by the USBE SES for LEAs in this tier.

Assisting Tier

LEAs in the Assisting Tier have one or more areas of moderate need demonstrated over one to three years. USBE SES-identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a PIP developed by the LEA with direct assistance from the USBE SES. A progress report on the PIP is reviewed by a USBE SES-assigned mentor before the plan is submitted to the RDA Specialist. LEA special education program implementation is assisted by the USBE SES for LEAs in this tier.

Coaching Tier

LEAs in the Coaching Tier have either one area of intense need or multiple areas of moderate need demonstrated over one to three years. USBE SES-identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a USBE-SES and LEA jointly-developed PIP. A progress report on the PIP is reviewed by a USBE-SES-assigned coach before the plan is submitted to the RDA Specialist. LEA special education program implementation is coached by the USBE SES for LEAs in this tier.

Directing Tier

LEAs in the Directing Tier have multiple areas of intensive need and/or needs demonstrated over several years. USBE SES- identified areas of need are targeted through activities and interventions outlined in a USBE SES and LEA jointly-developed multi-year PIP. A coach is assigned by the USBE SES to follow up with the LEA on progress toward the PIP up to six hours per month. At a minimum, a written progress report based on the PIP is submitted to the RDA Specialist by the LEA on an annual basis. LEA special education program implementation is directed by the USBE SES for LEAs in this tier.

Technical assistance providers are vetted by the USBE SES to ensure adequate subject matter knowledge and to ensure that consistent, accurate, and evidence-based information is disseminated. Evaluation systems are in place to determine impact and effectiveness of TA on teacher behavior and student outcomes.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The Utah Professional Development Network (UPDN) addresses Utah’s special education professional development (PD) needs. The UPDN consists of multiple components intentionally focused on positively affecting the results of students with disabilities. Irrespective of established Results-Driven Accountability and compliance priorities, this model incorporates the vital professional development elements strengthening teacher practice, and subsequent student learning. Importantly, the UPDN model identifies the component parts, including the need for tiered LEA supports as identified by both the UPIPS process and through LEA request. Stakeholders, using data analysis, developed UPDN priorities. All PD is evidence-based. Offered at the top of the model, is a nine-item description of the operating UPDN model.

Nine Item Model Summary

1. Using the APR, data, and advice from the UPDN Advisory Board and stakeholders, the USBE SES leadership set PD priorities. These priorities include school-to-post-school transition, effective instruction, student engagement in mathematics and reading/English language arts and behavior. (Behavior was added by the UPDN Advisory Board in the spring of 2017.) All priorities directly impact college and career readiness and prepare students with disabilities for skilled and competitive employment, involvement in post-secondary education, and independent living.
2. The UPDN Core Team, in collaboration with the USBE SES, organizes priority-driven PD for all LEAs, recognizing that all LEAs receive universal-level PD.
3. LEAs request UPDN support associated with identified PD priorities or needs specific to their respective LEA using the “single point

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

of entry” internet-based request system. They click on a “need assistance” button and fill out a brief form, including contact information.

4. Within 48 hours, a UPDN team member contacts the person requesting assistance to discuss their LEAs respective needs and directs the person requesting assistance to an approved provider.
5. The UPDN system screens “approved providers” that can plan, deliver and evaluate PD to LEA staff upon request.
6. LEAs receive differentiated levels of support based on results and compliance data as well as by LEA request.
7. The coordinated system of PD improves results for students with disabilities, as measured by outcome data.
8. Internal evaluation is systematically conducted, assessing the quality, relevance, and fidelity of PD events.
9. The entire UPDN system is externally evaluated annually to determine if the project is addressing identified goals.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

During FFY 2017, in preparation for the APR and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), requirements and indicators continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. Changes and updates in OSEP and USBE SER requirements were articulated during these meetings. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education meetings, committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder engagement and input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum, as well as Design Thinking, as a strategy to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

Each February, the State reports to the public on its progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets. The APR is posted on the USBE’s website (<https://schools.utah.gov/file/862e0388-aad0-46d3-9116-6b403ef7be6a>). The final APR is shared at the first regularly scheduled meetings of the USBE and USEAP, and with the LEA Special Education Directors after submission. Results are also shared with the Utah Parent Center, Utah’s Parent Training and Information Center. Prior to April 15 of each year (within 120 days of the State’s submission of its APR), the USBE SES prepares and publishes a summary of indicators that are required to be publicly reported for each LEA. The report is posted on the USBE website (<https://schools.utah.gov/file/138b8db4-2108-4c25-ad80-b2f0db242923>) and is made available for posting on LEA websites.

The results of the FFY 2017 APR will be reported to the Utah State Board of Education in the March 2018 Board meeting.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			73.40%	73.30%	85.70%	85.70%	83.00%	71.80%	71.80%	62.13%	66.32%
Data		73.20%	72.90%	71.10%	81.00%	81.00%	85.10%	58.60%	60.91%	65.02%	68.23%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	69.59%	71.48%
Data	67.93%	70.22%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	72.91%	74.37%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Utah Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan, which was in effect at the time of this data period, discusses graduation rates of less than 67% resulting in Comprehensive Support and Improvement school status. Utah's Plan includes the following graduation rate goals.

Utah's graduation rate goal is to cut by one-third the graduation deficit between 100 percent and the state's graduation rate for all students and student groups by 2022. Utah's graduation rate for the 2016 school year was 85 percent (rounded), which represents a graduation deficit of 15 percent (rounded). Cutting the graduation deficit by one-third would mean reaching a graduation rate of 90 percent by 2022. To reach a graduation rate of 90 percent, we will need to increase our graduation rate by approximately .8 percentage points each year. That is an increase of approximately 350 additional graduates each year. When this goal is reached, approximately 2,100 more students will have graduated.

Utah's Graduation Rate Goal by Student Group Student Group Baseline

Student Group	Baseline	Long-term Goal
All Students	85.2	90.1
Economically Disadvantaged students	75.6	83.7
Students with disabilities	70.2	80.1
English Learners	65.7	77.1
African American/Black	74.1	82.7
Asian	89.7	93.1
Hispanic/Latino	75.1	83.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	71.4	80.9
Multi-race, Non-Hispanic	81.5	87.7
Native Haw./Pacific	84.6	89.7
White	87.9	91.9

(Extended to one decimal point.)

Source: Utah State Board of Education, Spring 2017

As the APR Indicator 1 targets were created before Utah's ESSA Plan was approved, Utah stakeholders felt that a 60% target was not appropriately rigorous, Utah will apply the target of either 85.7% or a 2% increase of the previous year as the state graduation target. However, the GRADS 360 structure does not allow for that flexibility, so starting with the FFY 2013 target, it required a 2% increase from the FFY 2012 state rate of 60.91% and the remaining year's targets are listed as projected targets starting with FFY 2015 and will be revised to show the required 2% increase if the annual target of 85.7% is not met. FFY 2015 targets were based off of the FFY 2014 data of 68.23%.

Both documents were presented to stakeholders at State Board meetings and disseminated publicly for comment prior to finalization
2/3/2019


ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

and approval. The Utah ESSA Plan was completed in 2018. Stakeholder input and public meetings were held throughout the process to ensure stakeholder engagement.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,201	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,615	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	69.36%	Calculate 

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
3,201	4,615	70.22%	72.91%	69.36%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

A description of of Utah graduation requirements is located in Utah Administrative Rule R277-700-6. Basic information is provided below and specific detail is found at <https://rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-700.htm#T4>:

- Earn a minimum of 24 units of credit through course completion or through competency assessment.
 - Language Arts (4.0 Units of Credit).
 - Mathematics (3.0 Units of Credit).
 - Science (3.0 Units of Credit).
 - Social Studies (3.0 Units of Credit).
 - Arts (1.5 Units of Credit).
 - Physical and Health Education (2.0 Units of Credit).
 - Career and Technical Education (1.0 Units of Credit).
 - Digital Studies (0.5 Units of Credit).
 - General Financial Literacy (0.5 Units of Credit).
 - Electives (5.5 Units of Credit).
 - Library Media Skills (integrated into all subject areas).
- LEAs shall use Board-approved summative adaptive assessments to assess student mastery.
- An LEA may modify a student's graduation requirements to meet the unique educational needs of a student if: (i) the student has a disability; and (ii) the modifications to the student's graduation requirements are made through the student's individual IEP.

USBE Rule R277-705-5 (<https://rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-705.htm>) addresses graduation requirements for students with disabilities.

A. A student with disabilities served by special education programs shall satisfy high school completion or graduation criteria, consistent with state and federal law and the student's IEP.

R277-705-5(1) requires students with disabilities served by special education programs to satisfy high school completion or graduation requirements, consistent with state and federal law and the students' IEPs. The USBE Special Education Rules (SER) VII.C.2 allows the IEP team to amend graduation requirements and require that any amendments must be documented in the IEP. Amendments may include modifications, substitutions, and/or exemptions made to accommodate the needs of the individual student. R277-700.6(22) allows graduation requirements modifications to meet the unique educational needs of a student if: (i) the student has a disability; and (ii) the modifications to the student's graduation requirements are made through the student's individual IEP. The Rule requires that the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

LEA document the nature and extent of the modification, substitution, or exemption made to a student's graduation requirements in the student's IEP. R277-700.6(24) offers further guidance regarding substitutions in graduation requirements: An LEA may modify graduation requirements for an individual student to achieve an appropriate route to student success if the modification: (a) is consistent with: (i) the student's IEP; or (ii) Student Education and Occupation Plan/ Plan for College and Career Readiness; (b) is maintained in the student's file; (c) includes the parent's signature; and (d) maintains the integrity and rigor expected for high school graduation, as determined by the Board.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

USBE received TA from NTACT for Utah's annual Transition Institute in February 2018. Utah sent a team of transition stakeholders and inter agency transition partners to the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in May 2018. Utah provided targeted Indicator 2 training for new LEA special education directors and LEA directors with high Indicator 1 and 2 risk scores during the 2017-18 school year. USBE developed a TA video module for Indicator 2 data in 2018.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.80%	4.70%	4.70%	5.60%	5.55%	5.43%	5.32%	42.00%	39.90%
Data		4.90%	4.80%	4.80%	5.65%	4.50%	4.20%	8.90%	7.70%	42.00%	30.30%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	37.90%	36.00%
Data	29.82%	27.69%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	34.20%	32.49%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE Special Education Services (SES) statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrators Meeting (USEAM).

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,369	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	130	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	128	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,353	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	24	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,353	5,004	27.69%	34.20%	27.04%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

The Indicator 2 dropout rate comes from the EDFacts 009 report data according to the EDFacts 009 specifications.

Definition of Single-Year Dropouts are students who left ninth through twelfth grade with a reason of Unknown, Withdrawn, Dropout, Expelled, Transferred to Adult Education, Exited to take the GED1, or Graduation Pending. Additionally, if the student finished the school year and was expected to return to school the next year, or transferred to another public school within the state (including district and charter schools) and did not reappear by September 30 of the following school year, then he/she counts as a dropout. Finally, if the student was a retained senior but did not reappear by September 30 of the following school year, then he/she counts as a dropout. This count does not include students who transferred to home school, private school, or a school outside of the state or country. Students who withdrew for medical reasons are also excluded from the dropout count. This definition is consistent with the federal definition of a Single-Year Dropout.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

USBE received TA from NTACT for Utah's annual Transition Institute in February 2018. Utah sent a team of transition stakeholders and inter agency transition partners to the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in May 2018. Utah provided targeted Indicator 2 training for new LEA special education directors and LEA directors with high Indicator 1 and 2 risk scores during the 2017-18 school year. USBE developed a TA video module for Indicator 2 data in 2018.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	97.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		99.60%	99.30%	99.53%	99.62%	99.70%	99.60%	99.49%	99.56%	98.17%	96.43%
Math	A Overall	2013	Target ≥			95.00%	98.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.00%	97.70%	98.10%	99.50%	99.70%	99.40%	99.12%	99.70%	98.04%	96.23%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	93.45%	91.39%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	93.53%	91.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Utah had high participation rates up until FFY 2014. In FFY 2014, Utah introduced the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards. Simultaneously, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. As a result, participation rates have been decreasing. However, Utah will maintain targets and continue to promote participation.

Throughout FFY 2017 requirements, progress, and APR indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and LEA Assessment Directors in order to reach a greater number of stakeholders. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems.

The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education and has had a focus around improving student outcomes through increasing participation in Utah's statewide accountability assessments.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	8026	8214	7808	7105	6068	5716	n	4760	n	n	n

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6869	6965	6452	5757	4893	4604		3664			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	117	150	139	139	86	43		20			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	439	443	472	431	505	489		423			

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	8030	8208	7802	7100	5967	5634	n	4770	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6873	6945	6428	5716	4759	4467		3695			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	119	151	146	157	106	62		34			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	438	443	472	430	505	489		430			

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	47,697	43,100	91.39%	95.00%	90.36%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Utah had high participation rates up until FFY 2014. In FFY 2014, Utah introduced the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards. Simultaneously, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. As a result, participation rates have been decreasing. However, Utah will maintain targets and continue to promote participation.

Throughout FFY 2017 requirements, progress, and APR indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and LEA Assessment Directors in order to reach a greater number of stakeholders. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems.

The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education. USBE collaboration has had a focus around improving student outcomes through increasing participation in Utah's statewide accountability assessments. The USBE Special Education and Assessment departments have been collaborating with LEAs to share data, participation strategies, and promote the instructional value of statewide assessment data.

The USBE continues to participate in the 1% Cap Communities of Practice and the Council of Chief State School Offices Assessing Special Education Students collaborative (CCSSO ASES) to help continue the focus on increasing outcomes for students with disabilities. USBE has leveraged information, resources, strategies, and ideas through this collaboration to refine policy and increase TA for LEAs throughout Utah. The policy and TA USBE has provided promoted student participation in Utah's assessments by outlining assessment participation criteria and expectations, strengthen understanding of the appropriate use of accommodations from instruction to assessment, and increasing evidenced-based practices for instruction.

Each school's participation rate is posted on their individual school report card available on Utah's Data Gateway.

<https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/>

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	47,511	42,865	91.49%	95.00%	90.22%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Utah had high participation rates up until FFY 2014. In FFY 2014, Utah introduced the State Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) statewide assessment, a complex computer adaptive assessment aligned with the Utah Core Standards. Simultaneously, Utah lawmakers passed legislation outlining a parent's right to opt their children out of statewide testing. As a result, participation rates have been decreasing. However, Utah will maintain targets and continue to promote participation.

Throughout FFY 2017 requirements, progress, and APR indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and LEA Assessment Directors in order to reach a greater number of stakeholders. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems.

The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education. USBE collaboration has had a focus around improving student outcomes through increasing participation in Utah's statewide accountability assessments. The USBE Special Education and Assessment departments have been collaborating with LEAs to share data, participation strategies, and promote the instructional value of statewide assessment data.

The USBE continues to participate in the 1% Cap Communities of Practice and the Council of Chief State School Offices Assessing Special Education Students collaborative (CCSSO ASES) to help continue the focus on increasing outcomes for students with disabilities. USBE has leveraged information, resources, strategies, and ideas through this collaboration to refine policy and increase TA for LEAs throughout Utah. The policy and TA USBE has provided promoted student participation in Utah's assessments by outlining assessment participation criteria and expectations, strengthen understanding of the appropriate use of accommodations from instruction to assessment, and increasing evidenced-based practices for instruction.

Each school's participation rate is posted on their individual school report card available on Utah's Data Gateway.

<https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/>

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://datagateway.schools.utah.gov/>
<https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/>

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A 3-8	2015	Target ≥					83.00%	83.00%	83.00%		62.00%	17.38%	13.44%
			Data					48.19%	48.96%	51.00%	52.08%	51.61%	17.38%	13.44%
	B 10-12	2015	Target ≥					82.00%	82.00%	82.00%		63.16%	13.05%	8.67%
			Data					45.58%	50.63%	53.58%	54.39%	52.65%	13.05%	8.67%
Math	A 3-8	2015	Target ≥					45.00%	45.00%	45.00%		58.39%	20.11%	17.06%
			Data					42.05%	45.95%	46.43%	45.79%	47.11%	20.11%	17.06%
	B 10-12	2015	Target ≥						40.00%	40.00%		42.38%	7.86%	7.15%
			Data					40.00%	37.53%	25.67%	26.05%	22.96%	7.86%	7.15%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A 3-8	Target ≥	15.48%	16.98%
		Data	15.48%	14.97%
	B 10-12	Target ≥	8.50%	10.00%
		Data	8.50%	8.45%
Math	A 3-8	Target ≥	17.61%	19.61%
		Data	17.61%	17.94%
	B 10-12	Target ≥	7.08%	9.08%
		Data	7.08%	6.55%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ 3-8	18.48%	19.98%
	B ≥ 10-12	11.50%	13.00%
Math	A ≥ 3-8	21.61%	23.61%
	B ≥ 10-12	11.08%	13.08%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2017, in preparation for the APR and the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and LEA Assessment Directors. Data on the proficiency rates of SWD on the DLM Alternate Assessment and proficiency and trend rates of students with disabilities on the SAGE assessment were shared with stakeholders. APR information, including targets, is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, emails, and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) Date: 12/13/2018

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	7425	7558	7063	6327	5484	5136	n	4107	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1610	1271	1039	717	454	298		261			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	14	10	8	12	n	n		n			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	76	102	143	96	187	177		153			

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) Date: 12/13/2018

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	7430	7539	7046	6303	5370	5018	n	4159	n	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1987	1813	1283	668	554	372		192			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	18	11	11	6	6	7		n			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	76	108	69	49	51	37		50			

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A 3-8	38,993	6,221	14.97%	18.48%	15.95%
B 10-12	4,107	416	8.45%	11.50%	10.13%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A 3-8	38,706	7,126	17.94%	21.61%	18.41%
B 10-12	4,159	246	6.55%	11.08%	5.91%

Reasons for Group B Slippage

During FFY 2017, Utah has continued to support the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, focusing on increasing student outcomes in mathematics in grades 6-8 (group A). Group A has continued to increase their proficiency every year, demonstrating that Utah's focus is having a positive impact. Utah expects continued progress and increased student outcomes that should be sustained and reflected in the grades beyond 6-8.

All students (group A and group B) who participated in the SAGE assessment with accommodations increased proficiency scores in FFY17 by almost 1 percentage point. Students in group A who participated without accommodations increased their proficiency scores by 1.5 percentage points. Students in group B who participated without accommodations increased their proficiency scores by 0.5 percentage points.

ADA Compliant 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

accommodations also increased their proficiency scores, which also demonstrates that Utah's focus for the SSIP on grades 6-8 is working.

The Proficiency of students from the 10th grade (group B) who participated in the alternate assessment slipped from 12.3% to 11.6%. This slippage may in part be a result of the decreased number of students participating in Utah's alternate assessments. Utah has continued efforts to provide technical assistance (TA) to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the appropriate assessment and that only those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are participating in Utah's alternate assessments. In previous years, the students who did not have a significant cognitive disability that were participating in Utah's alternate assessments earned higher proficiency scores than their peers. Therefore, in FFY17 those students participated in the appropriate assessment and were removed from the proficiency calculation of the alternate assessment likely impacting slippage for this group.

Another factor that likely plays into the slippage of group B is Utah's parental opt out right. The parent opt out rate for grade 10 math increased from 7.4% (351 students) to 9.7% (463 students). Over 100 additional students who were expected to test but were parentally opted out of testing. USBE research into the opt out data has shown that a large proportion of the students who opt out scored proficient in their previous year's test. These include students who, for example, are enrolled in Advanced Placement (AP) courses and would therefore prefer to focus their efforts on studying for taking AP exams than statewide assessments. The additional students who opted out who likely would have scored proficient could be a contributing cause of the slippage. Utah would have only needed 28 additional proficient students to have avoided slippage in FFY2017.

Parent opt out board rule <https://rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-404.htm#T7>

Parent Rights, Utah legislative code <https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title53G/Chapter6/53G-6-S803.html>

The USBE continues to participate in the 1% Cap Communities of Practice and the Council of Chief State School Officer's Assessing Special Education Students collaborative (CCSSO ASES) to help continue the focus on increasing outcomes for students with disabilities. USBE has leveraged information, resources, strategies, and ideas through this collaboration to refine policy and increase TA for LEAs throughout Utah. The policy and TA USBE has provided promoted student participation in Utah's assessments by outlining assessment participation criteria and expectations, strengthen understanding of the appropriate use of accommodations from instruction to assessment, and increasing evidenced-based practices for instruction.

During FFY 2017, Utah continued to promote the SSIP which focuses on middle school mathematics proficiency, including high expectations for all students, multi-tiered systems of supports in secondary settings, and improving students' access to core instruction. Information, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP). APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, emails, and social media. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education to continue work towards increasing student outcomes.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://datagateway.schools.utah.gov/>

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			3.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		4.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after a review of historical data, in consultation with the USBE SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Education Administrators Meeting (USEAM).

During FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. USBE values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the development of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Leading By Convening as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 23

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	126	0%	0%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2016 (SY 2016-2017) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.07%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.07% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged. Of the 149 LEAs in 2016-17, 126 met the minimum n size of 30. Of the 23 that did not meet the minimum n size, all of them had a 0% suspension rate. Note that across the entire state, only 56 students with disabilities were suspended for more than 10 days in SY 2016-2017. These 56 students were in 17 LEAs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Staff received technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) both attending conferences, online, and in person. As a result professional development has been created that included knowledge gained to assist LEAs to improve compliance and improve outcomes for students.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State makes continued efforts to conduct periodical reviews of suspension data submitted by each LEA. In addition to improvements of the data collection system both at the local and state levels, several USBE SES department meetings were conducted to discuss and plan for continued improvements to policies and practices related to disciplinary data collections. USBE SES staff met with LEA Superintendents to discuss the disciplinary data from each of their LEAs to determine areas of improvement and determine the need for technical assistance. USBE SES and the Utah Personnel Development Center (UPDN) (the USBE SES's professional development arm) provided LEAs and partner agencies universal, targeted and intensive professional development and technical assistance through in-person meetings and conferences, webinars, online modules, phone calls and emails regarding positive IEP development and implementation, behavior supports, school discipline plans, and IDEA discipline procedures. In addition, the USBE SES, in collaboration with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's Parent Training and Information Center) provided LEAs, partner agencies, and parents with information about all the above topics as well as the Procedural Safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 34

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	115	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The USBE uses the "State-bar" method for defining significant discrepancy. The FFY 2016 (SY 2016-2017) State rate for suspending/expelling students with disabilities among LEAs in the State for more than ten days is 0.07%. The USBE set the "State-bar" as five percentage points higher than the State rate. Thus, any school district/charter school that suspends or expels 5.07% or more of its students with disabilities for more than ten days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be an "n" size of at least 30 students with disabilities in the LEA in the denominator of a suspension rate for it to be flagged.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Staff received technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) both attending conferences, online, and in person. As a result professional development has been created that included knowledge gained to assist LEAs to improve compliance and improve outcomes for students.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Utah makes continued efforts to conduct periodical reviews of suspension data submitted by each LEA. In addition to improvements of the data collection system both the local and state levels, several USBE SES department meetings were conducted to discuss and plan for continued improvements to policies and practices related to disciplinary data collections. USBE SES staff met with LEA Superintendents to discuss the disciplinary data from each of their LEAs to determine areas of improvement and determine the need for technical assistance. USBE SES and the Utah Personnel Development Center (UPDN) (the USBE SES's professional development arm) provide LEAs and partner agencies universal, targeted and intensive professional development and technical assistance to LEAs through in-person meetings and conferences, webinars, online modules, phone calls and emails regarding positive IEP development. In addition, implementation, behavior supports, school discipline plans, IDEA discipline procedures. The USBE SES, in collaboration with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's Parent Training and Information Center) provides LEAs, partner agencies, and parents with information about all the above topics as well as the Procedural Safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			50.14%	51.15%	51.91%	52.88%	54.12%	55.53%	55.84%	56.81%	57.23%
		Data		48.68%	59.64%	51.40%	52.36%	53.58%	54.98%	55.29%	56.35%	56.81%	58.11%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.28%	15.66%	15.25%	15.18%	14.91%	14.06%	13.82%	13.57%	13.50%
		Data		14.72%	15.82%	15.40%	15.33%	15.06%	14.20%	13.96%	13.48%	13.57%	12.37%
C	2005	Target ≤			3.52%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	3.00%	3.00%
		Data		3.56%	3.32%	3.25%	3.23%	3.06%	3.08%	3.15%	2.79%	2.59%	2.58%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	57.66%	58.09%
	Data	60.45%	61.57%
B	Target ≤	13.43%	13.36%
	Data	11.37%	10.68%
C	Target ≤	3.00%	3.00%
	Data	2.49%	2.61%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	58.53%	58.97%
Target B ≤	13.29%	13.22%
Target C ≤	3.00%	3.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data and targets, in consultation with the USBE SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administration Meeting (USEAM).

During FFY 2017, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a process to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education and works actively with the Utah Parent Center (UPC) in this process. Utah Special Education Directors and their teams also participate in data drills annually where indicator results are shared and reviewed.

Utah LEAs continue to work to increase the percent of students with disabilities receiving the majority of their services in general education settings with supports through co-teaching and ongoing collaboration between general and special education teachers. Support must be increased for both students and teachers in these settings through the development of tiered instruction framework documents, a deeper understanding of specially designed instruction and related services and supports as well as targeted professional development supporting the implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). Utah has 36 LEAs participating in the SPDG MTSS grant with a focus on increasing access and outcomes for students.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	73,465	null

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	46,630	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,535	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,793	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	31	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	106	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	46,630	73,465	61.57%	58.53%	63.47%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,535	73,465	10.68%	13.29%	10.26%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,930	73,465	2.61%	3.00%	2.63%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									36.41%	33.02%	33.22%
		Data								36.31%	40.58%	33.02%	32.37%
B	2011	Target ≤									41.26%	43.76%	43.56%
		Data								41.36%	38.01%	43.76%	44.71%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	33.42%	33.62%
	Data	35.37%	37.19%
B	Target ≤	43.36%	43.16%
	Data	40.95%	38.36%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	33.82%	36.32%
Target B ≤	42.96%	41.35%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed based on historical data, historical targets, and in consultation with the USBE SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), and LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel during a Utah State Special Education Administrator Meeting (USEAM). In addition, for Indicator 6, LEA Preschool Coordinators reviewed the proposed targets and provided input. Stakeholders agreed with the proposed targets from FFY 2013 through 2017, but due to the OSEP requirement that the 2018 target show improvement over baseline, the 2018 targets were adjusted to meet that requirement during FFY 2013.

In preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	10,731	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,282	null

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,562	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	160	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,282	10,731	37.19%	33.82%	39.90%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,722	10,731	38.36%	42.96%	34.68%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						95.09%	94.00%	94.05%	94.10%	90.52%	90.72%
		Data					95.09%	94.00%	94.80%	88.20%	88.51%	90.52%	87.95%
A2	2008	Target ≥						52.92%	52.74%	53.24%	53.74%	51.20%	51.40%
		Data					52.92%	52.73%	56.41%	47.60%	45.89%	51.20%	59.22%
B1	2008	Target ≥						93.20%	93.25%	93.30%	93.35%	89.96%	90.16%
		Data					93.20%	94.10%	94.50%	86.50%	87.95%	89.96%	87.17%
B2	2008	Target ≥						48.70%	49.20%	49.70%	50.20%	44.79%	44.99%
		Data					48.70%	51.84%	54.78%	43.70%	40.30%	44.79%	51.24%
C1	2008	Target ≥						93.91%	93.69%	93.74%	93.79%	90.70%	90.90%
		Data					93.91%	93.68%	94.35%	88.70%	88.42%	90.70%	90.51%
C2	2008	Target ≥						67.20%	67.70%	68.20%	68.70%	62.97%	63.17%
		Data					67.20%	67.97%	69.82%	61.90%	57.69%	62.97%	71.95%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	90.92%	91.12%
	Data	88.21%	87.97%
A2	Target ≥	51.60%	51.80%
	Data	59.03%	59.41%
B1	Target ≥	90.36%	90.56%
	Data	87.21%	86.93%
B2	Target ≥	45.19%	45.39%
	Data	52.69%	51.79%
C1	Target ≥	91.10%	91.30%
	Data	88.98%	88.87%
C2	Target ≥	63.37%	63.57%
	Data	71.43%	71.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	91.32%	95.10%
Target A2 ≥	52.00%	52.93%
Target B1 ≥	90.76%	93.21%
Target B2 ≥	45.59%	48.71%
Target C1 ≥	91.50%	93.92%
Target C2 ≥	63.77%	67.21%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed after a data analysis and in consultation with the USBE-SES statistician, and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), IHEs, and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrator Meeting (USEAM). In addition, LEA Preschool Coordinators reviewed the proposed targets

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
and provided input.

In preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and LEA Preschool Coordinators. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3986.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15.00	0.38%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	341.00	8.55%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1188.00	29.80%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1778.00	44.61%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	664.00	16.66%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2966.00	3322.00	87.97%	91.32%	89.28%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2442.00	3986.00	59.41%	52.00%	61.26%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15.00	0.38%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	415.00	10.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1418.00	35.57%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1841.00	46.19%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	297.00	7.45%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3259.00	3689.00	86.93%	90.76%	88.34%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2138.00	3986.00	51.79%	45.59%	53.64%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	25.00	0.63%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	255.00	6.40%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	849.00	21.30%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1926.00	48.32%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	931.00	23.36%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2775.00	3055.00	88.87%	91.50%	90.83%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2857.00	3986.00	71.57%	63.77%	71.68%

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Data is gathered through the statewide Utah Program Improvement Planning System for Special Education (UPIPS). USBE SES utilizes this website to collect compliance, fiscal and other LEA data. LEAs and the USBE-SES can generate reports on the compliance data collected. These data and reports are used in the UPIPS Self-Assessment process, the UPIPS on-site monitoring process, as well as the Annual Performance Report (APR). The UPIPS system has an assigned section titled Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD). Teachers collect and enter the student information into UPOD when a student enters preschool and when the student leaves preschool services, such as when the student transitions from preschool to kindergarten. The LEA report section provides an overall statewide outcomes report with "n" sizes and percentages that are transferred to the APR.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2015

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			91.00%	83.64%	85.33%	87.42%	87.33%	89.63%	89.27%	86.04%	89.92%
Data		91.00%	84.00%	85.20%	87.30%	87.20%	89.50%	89.18%	89.83%	86.06%	86.04%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	79.52%	79.52%
Data	79.52%	76.82%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	79.62%	80.52%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The targets were developed in consultation with the USBE SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the USEAP, and LEA Special Education Directors.

During FFY 2016, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors. This information was also presented at USEAP quarterly meetings. APR information is widely shared with the public during USBE full Board and committee meetings and via emails and social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review, not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as methodologies to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Stakeholder groups continue to be pleased with the brief and more focused, parent survey and feel that the proposed targets are appropriate, especially in consideration of national and Utah data trends. They proposed that the FFY 2017 target be the same as the baseline data which will continue to maintain the high level of parent involvement in special education that the data demonstrates. As OSEP requires, the FFY 2018 target demonstrates a statistically significant increase from the baseline data.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1462.00	1904.00	76.82%	79.62%	76.79%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	27.91%	6823.00
---	--------	---------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A stratified, representative sample of preK–12 students was chosen within each surveyed LEA. Results were weighted according to population size of the LEA to ensure the overall state parent involvement percentage was an accurate reflection of the experience of parents of students with disabilities ages 3 through 21. Parents of students at all grade levels (and ages) responded to the survey.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

For those LEAs that have more than 100 students, a sample of parents was chosen to receive the survey. The population was stratified by grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample. When calculating state-level results, responses were weighted by the student population size (e.g., an LEA that had four times as many students with disabilities as another LEA will receive four times the weight in computing overall state results). Note: The number of respondents who reported that the school facilitated parent involvement and the total number of respondents aren't whole numbers because weighting data often results in fractional weights.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The representativeness of the survey was assessed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the students whose parents responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all students with disabilities. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the grade level of the child; and (3) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 27% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a child with a speech/language impairment and 22% of students with disabilities in the entire sample have a speech/language impairment. Another example: 13% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a student who is Hispanic and 15% of the students with disabilities in the sample are Hispanic. Results were weighted by LEA to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Utah appreciated the technical assistance we received this past year related to meaningful parent engagement in the special education process. USBE's Family/Community Engagement Specialist is the team lead on a fellowship hosted by the Flamboyant Foundation based in Washington D.C. The Specialist then provided similar technical assistance and professional development to LEA Special Education Directors as well as eight individual LEAs who did meet the Indicator 8 target. In addition, the USBE works in conjunction with the Utah Parent Center (Utah's OSEP-funded Parent Training Information Center) in collecting and analyzing data and then creating technical assistance and professional development to address needs.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 46

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	108	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The USBE used FFY 2017 data for Indicator 9 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USBE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group within each LEA. Data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State is examined. A “Final” Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (cell size) and 30 or more students in the group of interest enrolled in the LEA (n size) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group (cell size) and 30 or more students in the comparison group (n size) enrolled in the LEA.

For Indicator 9, 154 LEAs are included in the analysis of the SY 2016–17 child count data. Of these 154 LEAs, 108 LEAs met the minimum n and cell size requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group). Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful risk ratios from being calculated. (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 149, Utah reported the 150 LEAs in the FFY 2016 APR but one LEA, Pioneer Charter High School for the Performing Arts, closed during the summer of 2018. The number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 154. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using SY 2016–17 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use SY 2017–18 data).

Utah revised its baseline in FFY 2016 to use the number of districts that met established minimum n and cell size as the denominator.

The number of districts in Utah that met the minimum n size was 108; the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n size was 46. ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Final Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above due to inappropriate identification. Once a ratio is flagged for suspected disproportionate representation, the policies, procedures, and practices of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the suspected disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

During FFY 2017, there were no LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Staff received technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) both attending conferences, online, and in person. As a result professional development has been created that included knowledge gained to assist LEAs to improve compliance and improve outcomes for students.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 85

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
8	0	69	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The USBE used FFY 2017 data for Indicator 10 collected through the State December 1 Special Education Child Count (618 data). The USBE calculates a Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group within each LEA. Data for all racial/ethnic groups in the State is examined. A "Final" Risk Ratio (based on the Weighted Risk Ratio) is determined only if there are 10 or more students with disabilities in the group of interest (cell size) and 30 or more students in the group of interest enrolled in the LEA (n size) and if there are also 10 or more students with disabilities in the comparison group (cell size) and 30 or more students in the comparison group (n size) enrolled in the LEA.

For Indicator 10, 154 LEAs were available for inclusion in the analysis. Of these 154 LEAs, 69 LEAs met the minimum n and cell size requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated. Many LEAs in Utah have between zero and five students of a particular race/ethnicity with a particular disability. Thus, very small numbers prevent reliable and meaningful Risk Ratios from being calculated. (For each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated—one for each of the seven racial/ethnic groups times the six primary disability categories.) (Note: The number of LEAs for Indicators 4A and 4B is 149) Utah reported the 150 LEAs in the FFY 2016 APR but one LEA, Pioneer Charter High School for the Performing Arts, closed during the summer of 2018. The number of LEAs for Indicators 9 and 10 is 154. This is because Indicators 4A and 4B are using SY 2016–17 data, while Indicators 9 and 10 use SY 2017–18 data).

Utah revised its baseline in FFY 2016 to use the number of districts that met established minimum n and cell size as the denominator.

The number of districts in Utah that met the minimum n size was 69; the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n size was 85.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Final Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above as a result of inappropriate identification. Once a ratio is flagged for suspected disproportionate representation, the policies, procedures, and practices of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the suspected disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

During FFY 2017, there were eight LEAs flagged as having a Weighted Risk Ratio above the cut score of 3.00. A careful review of each of these eight LEAs was conducted. These LEAs were required to submit documentation of their policies, procedures, and practices which were reviewed by the State to verify that there was no over-representation of any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. UPIPS monitoring data were also reviewed during this process, including student record reviews, evaluation, and identification procedures, as well as interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, and students. No disproportionate representation was found to be occurring in these LEAs based upon this review of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in §300.600(d)(3).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Staff received technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) both attending conferences, online, and in person. As a result professional development has been created that included knowledge gained to assist LEAs to improve compliance and improve outcomes for students.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		76.00%	95.20%	96.60%	96.90%	97.41%	94.58%	97.70%	98.88%	99.65%	99.47%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.28%	99.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
372	372	99.60%	100%	100%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	0
---	---

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

During the 2017–18 school year, a sampling of files of students aged 3 through 21 who received an initial evaluation were reviewed through On-Site Visits and the State dispute resolution process for this indicator (as part of the general supervision system). The files reviewed came from 37 LEAs (school districts, and charter schools). USBE SES has the responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements, including dispute resolution and general supervision responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities. The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system [Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS)] is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE SES review of each LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas (e.g., timeliness of data and fiscal reports, the LEA's Program Improvement Plan and use of internal monitoring for compliance; and indicators that cover both compliance with IDEA and USBE Special Education Rules and student outcomes/results. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, and Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities (including monitoring) for each LEA based on the LEA's level of identified need. USBE SES's Results-Driven Accountability and continuous-improvement monitoring system reflects the state intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process. UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of USBE support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the USBE according to the LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. Methods and procedures used to implement UPIPS are consistent, but flexible, in order to adapt to the individual needs of students, educational settings, and administrative realities. While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis of episodic procedural monitoring to one of active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results. As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State (i.e., USBE) to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) 1/9/2019 Page 2 of 4 requirement under IDEA and USBE Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of overdue evaluation(s), Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), etc. LEAs whose program improvement plans do not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds. Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices and the USBE SES verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction. In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE SES follows guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. This includes accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, including the correction of noncompliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, based upon the USBE SES's review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring. While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is implementing in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Utah's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Specialist attended the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) Center State Staff Summit to meet with other RDA specialists and discussion how to improve statewide compliance. As a result, we refined our onsite monitoring interview questions and our file compliance review process. We also updated our process to identify and notify LEAs of finding of noncompliance to the make the notification more explicit and to provide support for corrections immediately. Professional development was created and provided to LEAs to improve student outcomes.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2016, one LEA was issued a written finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11. The USBE SES verified that the LEA corrected the noncompliance found in its one identified noncompliant IEP. Then, the USBE SES verified the the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.301 by reviewing the LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address evaluation timeline policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of the LEA's IEPs to ensure the LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by ensuring students were evaluated within Utah's 45-school day timeline.

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

In FFY 2016, one LEA was issued a written finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11. The USBE SES verified that the LEA corrected the noncompliance found in its one identified noncompliant IEPs through a post-correction review. The USBE SES ensured that the correction was made as soon as possible and not later than one year after identification. Then, the USBE SES verified the the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.301 by reviewing the LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address eligibility timelines, policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of the LEA's IEPs to ensure the LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by ensuring students were evaluated within Utah's 45-school day timeline.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.80%	93.10%	95.10%	98.60%	98.50%	99.60%	99.83%	99.36%	99.75%	99.77%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.90%	99.74%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,478
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	508
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,886
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	64
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	17
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	1,886	1,889	99.74%	100%	99.84%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	3
--	---

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

LEA 1: The LEA had 1 transition of which was late resulting in a compliance rate of 0%. The assigned teacher reported the cause to be a failure to follow timelines due to not checking the data system that communicates with Part C for upcoming files which resulted in a delay in having an IEP developed by the third birthday. The USBE special education preschool specialist completed monitoring activities through a review of the data collection system with the teacher to ensure she knew how to review upcoming transitions and had the teacher detail the LEA's process to develop an IEP by the third birthday. The LEA is a rural district and has a small special education population. They had one file to review for compliance to the required transition timelines. USBE has provided technical assistance (telephone calls, face-to-face-meetings and email) to the LEA to ensure all staff understand the requirements of Indicator 12 and expect 100% compliance next school year.

LEA 2: The LEA had 144 transitions of which one was late resulting in a compliance rate of 98.92%. Based on a review of why the file was late, the LEA reported that the student file was sent to the wrong person due to a change in staffing. The late file was not discovered for a few weeks. The LEA developed a plan to avoid this situation occurring again by meeting monthly as a transition team to review upcoming transitions and notifying teachers directly through email to watch and prepare for upcoming assigned files. The USBE special education preschool specialist completed monitoring activities through a review of the program's systems to: meet timeline requirements for transition from Part C to Part B, develop and implement an IEP by the third birthday, record transition information in the data collection system, review transition data and plan for improvement. Ten files were also randomly selected to review for compliance to the required transition timelines.

LEA 3: The LEA had 120 transitions of which one was late resulting in a compliance rate of 98.81%. The LEA investigated the root cause as to why the teacher submitted a late IEP and determined she was not organized in many areas and released her from her teaching position for a culmination of reasons. The USBE special education preschool specialist completed monitoring activities through a review of the program's systems to: meet timeline requirements for transition from Part C to Part B, develop and implement an IEP by the third birthday, record transition information in the data collection system, review transition data and plan for improvement. Ten files were also randomly selected to review for compliance to the required transition timelines. USBE has provided technical assistance to this LEA through telephone calls, face-to-face meetings and email to ensure all staff understand the requirements of Indicator 12 and expect 100% compliance next school year.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Statewide database Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) has been fully operational since FFY 2009. TEDI accesses the Part C Statewide database daily to obtain a list of all children that meet four criteria: child is 27 months old, has not opted out, is actively enrolled, and is considered potentially eligible for Part B. Each child's data are transferred to TEDI with the child's demographic information. As the Part C database transfers a child into TEDI, TEDI then accesses the USBE's Statewide Student Identifier System (SIS) to provide that child with a unique identification number that will continue with that child throughout his/her public education experience in Utah. To ensure confidentiality, individual child-level data are only available to school personnel with the appropriate permissions within TEDI.

TEDI provides an up-to-date status of the Part C to Part B Transition meeting, the date of the child's third birthday, and whether the child was found eligible or not eligible. The Part C database and the Part B database (TEDI) provide data back and forth on a daily basis. Before a child's file can be closed out in Part C, the provider is required to reconcile data that has come from TEDI to ensure that the exit reason is accurately recorded for each child that has been referred to Part B.

TEDI provides the USBE SES and the LEAs with the necessary census data to ensure timely transitions from Part C to Part B. These transition data were collected from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. In the process of reviewing school district data on this indicator, the USBE SES followed guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Noncompliance with timelines for Indicator 12 (34 CFR §300.124) is identified during an annual review of the TEDI statewide database by the USBE UPIPS Specialist and included with general supervision data.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2016, five students, one each from five different LEAs, were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by their third birthdays. The USBE SES issued the LEAs a written finding of noncompliance. The USBE SES met with each LEA and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure students were evaluated for special education eligibility as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year. Additionally, the USBE SES completed a fidelity checklist of the transition process with each LEA to ensure the regulatory requirements were correctly implemented. Finally, the USBE SES reviewed additional files from each LEA to determine that each LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

In FFY 2016, five students, one each from five different LEAs, were not evaluated and determined eligible or ineligible for special education by their third birthdays. The USBE SES issued the LEAs a written finding of noncompliance. The USBE SES met with each LEA and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected to ensure students were evaluated for special education eligibility as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year. Additionally, the USBE SES completed a fidelity checklist of the transition process with each LEA to ensure the regulatory requirements were correctly implemented. Finally, the USBE SES reviewed additional files from each LEA to determine that each LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		78.00%	41.38%	78.64%		54.67%	58.00%	86.03%	87.72%	98.12%	99.75%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	92.41%	92.07%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
320	362	92.07%	100%	88.40%

Reasons for Slippage

The slippage is related to a need to recruit and retain special educators trained in school to post-school transition, as well as a change in professional development delivery. In FFY 2017 the Utah State Board of Education, Special Education Services (USBE-SES) provided opportunities of professional development to LEAs who had higher risk on their Results Driven Accountability (RDA) score. However, LEAs do continue to request professional development on topics of their choosing, and are not required to attend the professional development provided to them on the different APR indicators.

During FFY 2017, USBE SES provided Indicator 13 training to 80 LEA administrators/specialists at the Utah special education law conference in August 2017. In December 2017 and April 2018 USBE SES conducted Indicator 13 training to 75 of 154 LEA special education directors including new directors and directors who's LEAs were in the Coaching or Directing Tier of the Utah RDA system. Throughout the 2017-2018 school year 17 LEAs received targeted Indicator 13 training for directors/teachers/specialists totaling 140 educators. The USBE SES transition specialist has developed TA documents and learning modules for Indicator 13 compliance on the USBE website. At the time of this APR submission, 100% of files reviewed are in compliance with Indicator 13. Letters of findings were issued to six LEAs, all areas of noncompliance were corrected and LEAs with findings provided additional files as documentation of systemic understanding of Indicator 13.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data on this indicator were collected from 30 LEAs with secondary programs that were monitored through on-site Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) visits in 2017–2018 or were selected for Indicator 13 only file reviews. Trained USBE staff or contract monitors reviewed 362 files using the web-based compliance monitoring application. Of the 362 IEPs reviewed, 320 of the IEPs, or 88.4%, met the State requirements. As a result of the identified noncompliant IEPs, six LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance, in FFY 2017. The review process that was part of UPIPS was developed to ensure that each LEA is included in the formal monitoring process.

The USBE SES continuous improvement monitoring system, UPIPS, is based on the concept that monitoring is an ongoing process. UPIPS includes an annual USBE review of each LEA's performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators that cover both compliance and student outcomes/results. LEAs are assigned a risk score in each of the pre-identified areas and indicators based on their data in each area. After risk scores have been assigned, LEAs are assigned a Program Implementation Monitoring Tier (i.e., Supporting, Guiding, Assisting, Coaching, and Directing) which includes a package of supports and activities for each LEA based on the LEAs level of identified need. USBE SES's RDA and continuous improvement monitoring system reflects the state intent to emphasize a data-driven, systemic approach to compliance as well as improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities. Previous UPIPS implementation has been generally effective in assisting LEAs in maintaining procedural compliance with federal and state regulations, and has also resulted in increased LEA commitment to the monitoring process.

UPIPS continues to provide a focus on LEA performance on USBE Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, as well as additional levels of USBE support for LEAs with continuing uncorrected compliance issues which have not been corrected in one year, creating a process that is differentiated by results. This differentiation includes the level of monitoring by the USBE according to the LEAs performance in a variety of pre-identified areas and indicators. Methods and procedures used to implement UPIPS are consistent, but flexible, in order to adapt to the individual needs of students, educational settings, and administrative realities. While continuing the monitoring of IDEA compliance, renewed focus is on the systematic evaluation of the impact of special education services on student achievement. Thus, this model has shifted from the previous emphasis of episodic procedural monitoring to one of active strategic planning and continuous improvement within the framework of compliance and student results.

ADA Compliant: 02/04/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

As uncorrected noncompliance is identified, it is reported as a finding. A finding is a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA program is in noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute or regulation and a description of the data supporting the conclusion. Written notifications of findings occur as soon as possible and generally within one month of discovery. Except for findings identified through State complaints or due process hearings, individual instances of noncompliance in an LEA involving the same legal requirement under IDEA and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules are grouped together as one finding. An LEA will have multiple findings of noncompliance for the same time period if the LEA is noncompliant with more than one legal requirement. Upon written notification of noncompliance from the USBE SES, the LEA must correct the noncompliance in its policies, procedures, and practices as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. LEAs must demonstrate that all instances of noncompliance in each individual student file are corrected (Prong 1 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum). In addition, LEAs are required to write a program improvement plan to address their process for ensuring that the regulatory requirements are being implemented correctly throughout the LEA. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are required to document additional professional development on the regulatory requirements and submit additional monitoring data which demonstrates correction of the noncompliance in LEA policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2 of the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum), including completion of the transition plan. LEAs whose program improvement plans do not result in the correction of the noncompliance within one year receive enforcement actions from the USBE-SES; actions are selected to target the root cause/reason of the continuing noncompliance. Most common enforcement actions include required technical assistance, additional LEA professional development, and delay of IDEA funds. Correction occurs when the LEA revises noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices, and the USBE verifies the correction and notifies the LEA of the correction.

In the process of determining that the LEA corrected noncompliance on this indicator, the USBE SES follows guidance provided in the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. This includes accounting for all instances of noncompliance, identifying where the noncompliance occurred, the percentage level of noncompliance, and the root cause of the noncompliance; requiring the correction of LEA noncompliance in the policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to or resulted in the noncompliance; and determining that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, including the correction of noncompliance in accordance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, based upon the USBE SES's review of updated data collected from either subsequent on-site monitoring or additional LEA data submissions (Desk Audits). While a sample of files were reviewed to determine ongoing LEA compliance with all specific regulatory requirements of IDEA, each file with noncompliance was also reviewed to ensure correction at the individual student level. As a result of these USBE SES and LEA actions, each LEA is in accordance with IDEA regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance will continue to be provided to achieve the target of 100%. Data indicate Utah continues efforts towards improvement in meeting the compliance requirements of Indicator 13 and will continue efforts to meet the target of 100%.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? Yes No

At what age are youth included in the data for this indicator? 14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah's annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance. Utah received TA from National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) on Indicators 13 & 14 during Utah's annual Transition Institutes from June Gothberg (2014-2018). There were 45 LEAs who participated in Utah's Transition Institute in 2017 and 57 LEAs who participated in 2018. Utah is also participating in quarterly NTACT Rural states webinar training. The USBE SES Transition Specialist is receiving ongoing technical assistance from June Gothberg, Paula Kohler, Jennifer Coyle, and Jacqueline Hyatt at NTACT.

The USBE SES Transition Specialist attended the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 including attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2016, six LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13. The USBE SES verified that each LEA corrected the noncompliance found in each identified IEP. Then, the USBE SES verified the six LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing each LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address transition policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of each LEA's IEPs to ensure each LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by developing compliant transition plans.

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

In FFY 2016, six LEAs were issued written findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13. The USBE SES verified that each LEA corrected the noncompliance found in each identified IEP through a post-correction review. The USBE SES ensured that all corrections were made as soon as possible and not later than one year after identification. Then, the USBE SES verified the six LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320 by reviewing each LEA's Program Improvement Plan to address transition policies, procedures and practices. In addition, USBE SES reviewed a representative sample of each LEA's IEPs to ensure each LEA was systemically implementing the regulatory requirements by developing compliant transition plans.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							27.60%	27.90%	28.60%	24.50%	25.25%
		Data						27.56%	33.10%	24.90%	27.60%	24.50%	20.82%
B	2009	Target ≥							54.30%	54.60%	55.30%	67.67%	70.67%
		Data						54.25%	68.10%	64.70%	66.30%	67.67%	65.35%
C	2009	Target ≥							71.80%	72.10%	72.80%	81.83%	84.83%
		Data						71.84%	80.60%	80.90%	81.01%	81.83%	79.72%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	26.00%	27.50%
	Data	19.35%	20.74%
B	Target ≥	72.67%	75.67%
	Data	64.63%	66.82%
C	Target ≥	87.83%	90.83%
	Data	79.46%	82.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	28.25%	29.00%
Target B ≥	78.67%	81.67%
Target C ≥	93.83%	96.83%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were developed in consultation with the USBE SES statistician and subsequently reviewed and adopted by USBE SES staff, the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP), IHEs, and LEA Special Education Directors during a Utah State Special Education Administrator Meeting (USEAM) meeting.

Data from previous years were analyzed to determine patterns of improvement or slippage over time in each target area. Based on this analysis, the focus for improvement will be in the following priority: decrease in number of youth who are unengaged or underengaged in postsecondary education/training, and employment by increasing the number of youth completing at least one term of postsecondary education and increasing the number of youth meeting all requirements of competitive employment.

During FFY 2017, in preparation for the APR and the SSIP, requirements, progress, and indicator results continued to be shared with LEA Special Education Directors and IHE personnel. This information was also presented at quarterly meetings of the USEAP. Annual Indicator data are widely shared with the public during Utah State Board of Education (USBE) full Board and committee meetings, via email, and on social media. Utah values stakeholder input and solicits ongoing feedback and review not only for the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP and revision to targets (as needed) in the APR, but also for data analysis and improvement planning across systems. The USBE is utilizing the Collaboration Continuum and Design Thinking as a methodology to increase collaboration across the USBE and public education.

Targets were not amended for FFY 2017.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1601.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	324.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	777.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	113.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	136.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	324.00	1601.00	20.74%	28.25%	20.24%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1101.00	1601.00	66.82%	78.67%	68.77%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1350.00	1601.00	82.63%	93.83%	84.32%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

	Statewide Population *		Ineligible Population *		Statewide Respondents	
Totals	N=4379		N=109		N=1601	
Male	2824	64%	75	69%	1031	64%
Female	1555	36%	34	31%	570	36%
Caucasian	3130	71%	75	69%	1215	76%
Minority†	1249	29%	34	31%	386	24%
Asian	39	0.9%	2	1.8%	16	1.0%
Black	97	2.2%	4	3.7%	30	1.9%
Hispanic	870	19.9%	25	22.9%	270	16.9%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	79	1.8%	2	1.8%	19	1.2%
Pacific Islander	59	1.3%	1	0.9%	19	1.2%
Multi-Racial	105	2.0%	0	0.0%	32	2.0%
Intellectual Disability	265	6%	8	7%	110	7%
Emotional Disturbance	169	4%	5	5%	45	3%
Specific Learning Disability	2823	64%	58	53%	1000	62%
Low Incidence Disability	1122	26%	38	35%	446	28%
Autism	302	6.9%	10	9.2%	142	8.9%
Deaf/Blind	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Hearing Impairment/Deaf	22	0.5%	4	3.7%	9	0.6%
Multiple Disabilities	102	2.3%	7	6.4%	46	2.9%
Other Health Impairment	587	13.4%	15	13.8%	209	13.1%
Orthopedic Impairment	14	0.3%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%
Speech Language Impaired	58	1.3%	0	0.0%	23	1.4%
Traumatic Brain Injury	18	0.4%	1	0.9%	4	0.2%
Visual Impairment	18	0.4%	1	0.9%	8	0.5%
Regular Diploma	3256	74%	0	0%	1277	80%
Certificate of Completion	53	1%	0	0%	25	2%
Maximum Age of Eligibility	168	4%	0	0%	80	5%
Dropped out	902	21%	0	0%	219	14%

State Population Successfully Completed Interviews = 37%

* = Ineligibles have been deleted from the Statewide Population and Statewide Sample

† Minority category may not total Population, Sample or Respondents as some exiters have "Unknown" recorded for ethnicity.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As Utah's annual determination is Needs Assistance, we appreciate the opportunity to receive national technical assistance. Utah received TA from National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) on Indicators 13 & 14 during Utah's annual Transition Institutes from June Gothberg (2014-2018). There were 45 LEAs who participated in Utah's Transition Institute in 2017 and 57 LEAs who participated in 2018. Utah is also participating in quarterly NTACT Rural states webinar training. The USBE SES Transition Specialist is receiving ongoing technical assistance from June Gothberg, Paula Kohler, Jennifer Coyle, and Jacqueline Hyatt at NTACT. The USBE SES Transition Specialist attended the NTACT Capacity Building Institute in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 including attendance at the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) of the Council for Exceptional Children mid-year cadre meetings with NTACT. Utah is receiving ongoing Indicator 14 TA from Mary Kampa, the Transition Improvement Grant Post School Outcomes Coordinator and Utah's post school outcomes survey contractor.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			75.00%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%		
Data		100%	85.71%	25.00%	50.00%	100%	100%	75.00%	0%		0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data	100%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than ten. Utah reported less than ten for this APR reporting period.

Data are reviewed annually with stakeholders, who agree that there is no need to identify targets or improvement activities at this time, due to the low "n" size.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	n
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

Explanation of Alternate Data

In 2017-2018, three resolution sessions were held. Two of the resolution sessions were resolved through settlement agreements; however, one resolution session was not resolved through a settlement agreement but we incorrectly reported that it had in the EMAPS Survey. We will make the modification on May 9, 2019 when states are allowed to modify the data.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2	3	0%		66.67%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Utah receives technical assistance (TA) from CADRE and participated with the Utah Parent Center in intensive TA to improving facilitated IEP processes provided by CADRE this past year. Utah also participates in quarterly IEP Facilitator and Mediator Workgroups hosted by the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) Center.

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%		
Data		87.50%	66.67%	33.33%	88.88%	100%	83.33%	33.33%	80.00%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		90.00%
Data	87.50%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Utah has a very low mediation request rate and has only averaged nine mediation requests per year over the past five years. All dispute resolution data, including mediation data, are reviewed annually with stakeholders including the Utah Special Education Advisory Panel and LEA Special Education Directors. Utah stakeholders agree that 90% is an appropriate target for mediation agreements achieved.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	11	10

Explanation of Alternate Data

In our EMAPS report, we mistakenly reported a mediation that took place after July 1, 2018 in the total count of mediations held. We will correct this data in EMAPS on May 9, 2019 when we are allowed to modify our final data.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2	7	10	100%	90.00%	90.00%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were three mediations related to due process complaints, however only two resulted in agreements.

Utah receives technical assistance (TA) from CADRE and participated with the Utah Parent Center in intensive TA to improving facilitated IEP processes provided by CADRE this past year. Utah also participates in a quarterly Mediator Workgroup hosted by the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) Center.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		9.32%	11.54%	13.76%	15.98%
Data	7.10%	8.70%	9.90%	9.80%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	18.20%

Key:

Description of Measure

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).

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 Report.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See Utah's attached Phase III Year 2 report.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See Utah's attached Phase III Year 2 report.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Utah will increase the number of students with Speech/Language Impairment (SLI) or Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) in grades six through eight who are proficient on the SAGE mathematics assessment by 11.11% over a five-year period.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Description

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Evaluation

- Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III year 2 report.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See Utah's attached SSIP Phase III Year 2 report.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Leah Voorhies

Title: Asst. Supt. of Student Support

Email: leah.voorhies@schools.utah.gov

Phone: 801-414-8434