

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 71.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 72.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 73.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.8%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 4.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 4.7%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 84%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 89%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 60%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.53% for reading and 98.05% for math. The FFY 2006 data were 99.67% for reading and 98.17% for math. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 97% for reading and 98% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
standards. [Results Indicator]		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 41.76% for reading and 46.03% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 43.6% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 42.8% for math.  The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 58% for reading and 59% for math.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.  The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.  As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
5. Percent of children with IEPs	The State's reported data for this indicator are:	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	<p>improve performance.</p>
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.64	51.40	51.15	+0.76%		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	15.82	15.40	15.66	+0.42%		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.32	3.25	3.317 (dec. by 0.1% over previo us year	+0.07%		
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>					<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 297 1444 1019"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 297 1062 472">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 297 1182 472">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 297 1325 472">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1325 297 1444 472">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 472 1062 540">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 472 1182 540">.76</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 472 1325 540">.90</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 472 1444 540">1.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 540 1062 675">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 540 1182 675">2.77</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 540 1325 675">3.19</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 540 1444 675">2.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 675 1062 776">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 675 1182 776">42.17</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 675 1325 776">43.63</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 675 1444 776">26.66</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 776 1062 876">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 776 1182 876">43.21</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 776 1325 876">42.80</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 776 1444 876">48.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 876 1062 977">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 876 1182 977">11.08</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 876 1325 977">9.49</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 876 1444 977">20.98</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 977 1062 1019">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 977 1182 1019">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 977 1325 1019">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 977 1444 1019">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	.76	.90	1.45	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	2.77	3.19	2.35	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	42.17	43.63	26.66	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	43.21	42.80	48.55	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	11.08	9.49	20.98	Total (approx. 100%)	100%	100.00%	100%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	.76	.90	1.45																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	2.77	3.19	2.35																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	42.17	43.63	26.66																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	43.21	42.80	48.55																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	11.08	9.49	20.98																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100%	100.00%	100%																											
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 85.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 83.59%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 83.64%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																												
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>																												

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of data.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of data.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that all six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEPMemorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 93.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 78.64%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 41.38%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 34 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case of noncompliance, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 79.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 72.0%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>school. [Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 507 of 518 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were subsequently corrected by January 30, 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system, and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		15 worksheet.
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not have any fully adjudicated hearings during this reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that one of four resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that one of six mediations resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR</p>

**Utah Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	§§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.