
RESULTS DRIVEN ACCOUNTABILITY (RDA) AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (APR) QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

NOTE: Indicator scores are calculated to determine whether local education agencies (LEAs) meet the minimum compliance requirements. Levels of risk determined in the RDA process range from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest level of risk. The RDA level of risk does not reflect implementation or indicate that an LEA is providing students with a free appropriate public education (FAPE).

INDICATOR DATA CALCULATIONS FOR RDA AND APR

Indicator 1: Graduation Rate for Students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students ages 14–21 who exited special education by graduating with a regular diploma}}{\text{(Number of students ages 14–21 who exited with a regular diploma + exited with an alternate diploma + received a certificate + reached maximum age + dropped out)}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ High school completion status codes are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Data is on a two-year lag (e.g., data for 2023 is for students who exited in 2021).
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate for Students with IEPs

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students ages 14–21 who exited special education by dropping out}}{\text{(Number of students ages 14–21 who exited with a regular diploma + exited with an alternate diploma + received a certificate + reached maximum age + dropped out)}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ High school completion status and dropout codes are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Data is on a two-year lag (e.g., data for 2023 is for students who exited in 2021).
- ◆ LEAs should review the Dropout Event Summary for special education in the Data Gateway in September of each year to identify students that have been coded as dropout and correct any errors.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points above the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 3A: Participation of Students with IEPs on Statewide Assessments

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs who participated in a statewide assessment}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs enrolled during the testing window}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 10, for both literacy and numeracy.
- ◆ First year Students Learning English are included in participation rate.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target for Indicator 3A is always 95.00%.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs on the Regular Assessment

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 10, for both literacy and numeracy.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs on the Alternate Assessment

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 10, for both literacy and numeracy.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

NOTE: In the event a state target for Indicator 3C is less than 10.00%, a percentage of five or more points below the target will result in an RDA risk score of 5 for that year.

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates Against Grade-Level Academic Achievement Standards

Proficiency rate for all students who scored at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards
– Proficiency rate for students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards

- ◆ Calculated separately for grades 4, 8, and 10, for both literacy and numeracy.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points above the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

NOTE: A negative percentage will result in a risk score of 1 but a data review will be required.

Indicator 4A: Significant Discrepancy in the Suspension & Expulsion Rates of Students with IEPs

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days in the school year}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEAs use their student information system (SIS) to track and document discipline and ensure the data is being correctly reported to the Utah State Board of Education (USBE).
- ◆ LEA special education directors can access the discipline data used in the calculation by downloading the Discipline Incident Summary for SPED report in Data Gateway.
- ◆ Data is on a two-year lag (e.g., data for 2023 is for students who were suspended/expelled in 2020–2021).
- ◆ A rate is calculated at the state level. A rate is also calculated at the LEA level if the LEA has at least two students in the numerator (cell size) and at least ten in the denominator (n size). The LEA rate is then compared to the state rate. If the LEA rate is greater than five times the state rate, the LEA will be required to complete a self-assessment of LEA policies, procedures, and practices.
- ◆ An LEA rate (that meets the minimum cell and n sizes) of greater than five times the state rate results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state rate changes every year.

NOTE: The state *target* for Indicator 4A is always 0.00%. LEA risk scores are based on the state *rate*.

Indicator 4B: Significant Discrepancy in the Suspension & Expulsion Rates of Students with IEPs Based on Race/Ethnicity

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs of target race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days in the school year}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs of target race/ethnicity}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ LEAs use their student information system (SIS) to track and document discipline and ensure the data is being correctly reported to the USBE.
- ◆ LEA special education directors can access the discipline data used in the calculation by downloading the Discipline Incident Summary for SPED report in Data Gateway.
- ◆ Data is on a two-year lag (e.g., data for 2023 is for students who were suspended/expelled in 2020–2021).
- ◆ A rate is calculated at the LEA level for all seven racial/ethnic groups. The LEA rate for each racial/ethnic group for which the LEA has at least two students in the numerator (cell size) and at least ten in the denominator (n size) is compared to the state rate calculated for Indicator 4A. If any rate calculated for the LEA is greater than five times the state rate, the LEA will be required to complete a self-assessment of LEA policies, procedures, and practices.
- ◆ An LEA rate (that meets the minimum cell and n sizes) of greater than five times the state rate results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state rate changes every year.

NOTE: The state *target* for Indicator 4B is always 0.00%. LEA risk scores are based on the state *rate*.

Indicator 5A: Access to the General Curriculum: Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in kindergarten (K) and aged 6–21 served in the regular class 80% or more of the day}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ December 1 Child Count Self-Contained Resource Attendance Management (SCRAM) environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of five or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 5B: Access to the General Curriculum: Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21 served in the regular class less than 40% of the day}}{\text{Total number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of five or more points above the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 5C: Access to the General Curriculum: Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}}{\text{Number of students with IEPs aged 5 in K and aged 6–21}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of five or more points above the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 6A: Preschool Settings: Students with IEPs Attending a Regular Program

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs ages 3–5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}}{\text{Total number of students ages 3–5 with IEPs}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 6B: Preschool Settings: Students with IEPs Attending a Special Class, School, or Residential Facility

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs ages 3–5 attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility}}{\text{Total number of students ages 3–5 with IEPs}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points above the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 6C: Preschool Settings: Students with IEPs Receiving Services in the Home

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students with IEPs ages 3–5 receiving special education and related services in the home}}{\text{Total number of students ages 3–5 with IEPs}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ December 1 Child Count SCRAM environment data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points above the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 7A1: Preschool Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills Summary Statement 1

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5 who improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by time of exit}}{(\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5 who did not improve positive social-emotional skills [including social relationships] + number who did improve by time of exit)}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD) entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 7A2: Preschool Outcomes: Positive Social-Emotional Skills Summary Statement 2

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5 whose positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) were within age expectations by time of exit}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 7B1: Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 1

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5 who improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) by time of exit}}{\text{(Number of PreK students with IEPs ages 3–5 who did not improve acquisition and use of knowledge and skills [including early language/communication and early literacy] + number who did improve by time of exit)}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 7B2: Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 2

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5 whose acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) were within age expectations by time of exit}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3–5}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 7C1: Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs Summary Statement 1

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3-5 who improved their use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by time of exit}}{(\text{Number of PreK students with IEPs ages 3-5 who did not improve their use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs} + \text{number who did improve by time of exit})} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 7C2: Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs Summary Statement 2

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3-5 whose appropriate behaviors to meet their needs were within age expectations by time of exit}}{\text{Total number of preschool students with IEPs ages 3-5}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ UPOD entry and exit scores are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of parents who gave a percent of max score of 67% or above AND who did not give any "Strongly Disagree" ratings on the parent survey}}{\text{Total number of parents who returned the parent survey}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Parent survey data are used for this indicator. The four largest LEAs participate in the parent survey every year. Half of the remaining LEAs participate in odd years and the other half in even years.

- ◆ Surveys are scored based on parent response to the 12 items on the survey: Strongly Agree = 3, Agree = 2, Disagree = 1, and Strongly Disagree = 0. The sum of a survey's points is divided by the total possible points: 36 to determine a "percent of max" score for each survey.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 points or more below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Risk Ratio (RR)

$$\frac{(\text{Number of students with IEPs of target race/ethnicity in LEA} \div \text{Total number of students enrolled of target race/ethnicity in LEA})}{(\text{Number of students with IEPs of all other races/ethnicities in LEA} \div \text{Total number of students enrolled of all other races/ethnicities in LEA})}$$

Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR)

RR weighted by state enrollment to account for variability in the racial/ethnic composition of LEAs

- ◆ December 1 Child Count data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ An RR is calculated for all seven racial/ethnic groups. A ratio of 3.0 means the target group's identification risk is three times higher than the other groups' risk.
- ◆ A WRR is calculated for each RR for which the LEA has at least five students in the numerator (cell size) and at least ten in the denominator (n size).
- ◆ If any WRR calculated for the LEA is 3.0 or higher, the LEA is flagged for possible disproportionate representation, and the LEA will be required to complete a self-assessment of LEA policies, procedures, and practices.
- ◆ An LEA self-assessment that determines the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification results in a risk score of 5.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Risk Ratio (RR)

$$\frac{(\text{Number of students with IEPs of target race/ethnicity \& target disability in LEA} \div \text{Total number of students enrolled of target demographics in LEA})}{(\text{Number of students with IEPs of all other races/ethnicities \& target disability in LEA} \div \text{Total number of students enrolled of same demographics in LEA})}$$

Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR)

RR weighted by state enrollment to account for variability in the racial/ethnic composition of LEAs

- ◆ December 1 Child Count data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ An RR is calculated for every combination of each of seven racial/ethnic groups and six disability categories (autism, behavior disorder, communication disorder, intellectual disability, other health impairment, and significant learning disability). A ratio of 3.0 means the risk of identifying the target group as special education is three times higher than the risk of identifying the other groups.
- ◆ A WRR is calculated for each RR for which the LEA has at least five students in the numerator (cell size) and at least ten in the denominator (n size).
- ◆ If any WRR calculated for the LEA is 3.0 or higher, the LEA is flagged for possible disproportionate representation, and the LEA will be required to complete a self-assessment of LEA policies, procedures, and practices.
- ◆ An LEA self-assessment that determines the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification results in a risk score of 5.

Indicator 11: Child Find Evaluation Timelines

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students whose initial evaluations were completed within 45 school days from receipt of consent}}{\text{Total number of students for whom parent consent to conduct the initial evaluation was received}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ State monitoring data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Evaluations delayed for reasons outlined in USBE Rules II.D.3. are included in the numerator.
- ◆ Risk score is based on the percentage of compliant files at the time of review.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target for Indicator 11 is always 100.00%.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of children referred by Part C found eligible for Part B and have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays}}{(\text{Total number referred to Part B} - \text{Number not eligible by 3rd birthday} - \text{Number delayed by parent refusal to consent} - \text{Number of late Part C eligibility})} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Transition from Early Intervention Data Input (TEDI) data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target for Indicator 12 is always 100.00%.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of students aged 14 and above with IEPs that include transition plans that meet all compliance requirements outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the USBE Rules}}{\text{Total number of students aged 14 and above}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ State monitoring data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Compliance requirements are outlined in USBE Rules VII.B.2.-5.
- ◆ Risk score is based on the percentage of compliant files at the time of review.
- ◆ A percentage of 10 or more points below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target for Indicator 13 is always 100.00%.

Indicator 14A: Post School Outcomes: Higher Education

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP at the time of leaving school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}}{\text{Total number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP at the time of leaving}} \right\} \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Post School Outcomes Survey data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Higher education is defined as a two- or four-year college. Respondents must have completed at least one term.

- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 14B: Post School Outcomes: Higher Education or Competitive Employment

$$\left[\frac{\text{(Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP at the time of leaving school, and were enrolled in higher education + were competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{Total number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP at the time of leaving}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Post School Outcomes Survey data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Competitive employment is defined as having worked at least 90 cumulative days in a community setting for 20 hours or more per week receiving minimum wage or greater.
- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

Indicator 14C: Post-School Outcomes: Higher Education or Competitive Employment or Other Postsecondary Education or Other Employment

$$\left[\frac{\text{(Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had an IEP at the time of leaving school, and were enrolled in higher education + were enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program + were competitively employed within one year of leaving high school + were in some other employment within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{Total number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP at the time of leaving school}} \right] \times 100$$

- ◆ Utah Post School Outcomes Survey data are used for this indicator.
- ◆ Other postsecondary education or training program is defined as any short-term education or training program, humanitarian program, or high school completion program. Respondents must have completed at least one term.
- ◆ Other employment is defined as having worked at least 90 cumulative days in any setting for any number of hours receiving minimum wage or greater.

- ◆ A percentage of 25 or more below the state target results in a risk score of 5.
- ◆ The state target changes every year.

ADDITIONAL INDICATOR CALCULATIONS FOR APR

Indicator 15: Dispute Resolution

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of due process complaint resolution meetings that resulted in a written resolution settlement agreement}}{\text{Total number of due process complaint resolution meetings}} \right\} \times 100$$

Indicator 16: Mediation

$$\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of mediation sessions that resulted in a mediation agreement}}{\text{Total number of mediation sessions}} \right\} \times 100$$

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Reduce the number of students aged 19–22 exiting a post-high program who report being unengaged or under-engaged on the Post School Outcomes Survey by 20 percentage points over a five-year period.

ADDITIONAL RISK SCORES FOR RDA

Reporting Deadlines

- ◆ LEAs must submit required data and fiscal reports by the deadlines outlined in the [USBE SES Deadlines and Testing Windows](#) spreadsheet.
- ◆ The risk score is based on how many reports are submitted late or not at all.

Fiscal

- ◆ LEAs submit a fiscal risk self-assessment with their IDEA application. Risk is determined based on the overall score received on the assessment.
- ◆ This is a measurement of risk, not compliance.

Internal Monitoring

- ◆ Each LEA is required to monitor a certain number of IEP files per year to maintain file compliance at the LEA level.
- ◆ The required number is based on the total number of special education students within the LEA as reported in the December 1 Child Count from the previous year.
- ◆ Details are outlined in the [UPIPS Manual](#).

Program Improvement Plan

- ◆ The USBE SES uses a rubric to score the Program Improvement Plan (PIP).
- ◆ The risk score reflects whether needs were addressed, whether student outcomes were considered, whether stakeholders were involved, and how timely the submission was.

USBE RESOURCES TO SUPPORT LEAs IN REDUCING RISK

Category	USBE Staff	USBE Webpage	Data Portal
Indicator 1: Graduation	Lavinia Gripentrog Phone: (801) 538-7645	Special Education School to Post-School Transition	Data Gateway
Indicator 2: Drop Out	Lavinia Gripentrog Phone: (801) 538-7645	Special Education School to Post-School Transition	Data Gateway Event Summary Report
Indicator 3A: Participation Data	Tracy Gooley Phone: (801) 538-7887	Special Education Accessibility, Accommodations, and Assessment	Data Gateway
Indicators 3B & 3C: Proficiency Data	Tracy Gooley Phone: (801) 538-7887	Special Education Accessibility, Accommodations, and Assessment	Data Gateway
Indicator 3B Instructional Support Team	Jennie Defriez (Coordinator) Phone: (801) 538-7522 Becky Unker (Elementary Math) Phone: (801) 538-7907 Brook Hatch (Secondary Math) Phone: (801) 538-7630 Ellen Bailey (Elementary Literacy) Phone: (801) 538-7721 Marianne Farnsworth (Secondary Literacy) Phone: (801) 538-7574	Special Education Effective Instruction and Inclusion	N/A
Indicator 3C Instructional Support	Tanya Semerad Phone: (801) 538-7726	Special Education Significant Cognitive Disabilities	N/A

Category	USBE Staff	USBE Webpage	Data Portal
Indicator 3D: Gap Data	Tracy Gooley Phone: (801) 538-7887	Special Education Accessibility, Accommodations, and Assessment	Data Gateway
Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion	Sarah Daniels Phone: (801) 538-7964	Safe and Healthy Schools Behavior Support Program	Data Gateway
Indicator 5: School Age Least Restrictive Environment	Lindsey Cunningham Phone: (801) 538-7806	Special Education Effective Instruction and Inclusion	SCRAM
Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environment	Chelsea Oaks Phone: (801) 538-7765	Special Education Preschool Indicator 6: Environment	SCRAM
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes	Chelsea Oaks Phone: (801) 538-7765	Special Education Preschool Indicator 7: Outcomes	UPOD
Indicator 8: Parent Participation	Susie Estrada Phone: (385) 295-7891	Family and Community Engagement	UPIPS Document Storage
Indicators 9 & 10: Disproportionate Representation	Natalie Fisher Phone: (801) 538-7644	APR Indicators: Indicator 9 APR Indicators: Indicator 10	Dec 1 Child Count
Indicator 11: Child Find Evaluation Timelines	Kelsey Gressmen Phone: (801) 538-7585	APR Indicators: Indicator 11	UPIPS Program Improvement Monitoring and Indicator Monitoring
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition	Chelsea Oaks Phone: (801) 538-7765	Special Education Preschool Indicator 12: Transition	TEDI
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	Kelsey Gressmen Phone: (801) 538-7585 Lavinia Gripentrog Phone: (801) 538-7645 Deanna Taylor Phone: (801) 538-7775	Special Education School to Post-School Transition	UPIPS Program Improvement Monitoring and Indicator Monitoring

Category	USBE Staff	USBE Webpage	Data Portal
Indicator 14: Post School Outcomes	Lavinia Gripentrog Phone: (801) 538-7645 Deanna Taylor Phone: (801) 538-7775	Special Education School to Post-School Transition	Utah Post School Outcomes Survey
Indicators 15 & 16: Dispute Resolution	Jessica Lamb Phone: (385) 295-7873	Special Education Student and Parent Rights	N/A
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)	Crystal Emery Phone: (801) 538-7999	Annual Performance Report (APR); State Performance Plan (SPP); State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Reports	Utah Statewide Collaborative on Postsecondary Transition
Reporting Deadlines	Jerry Rogers (EYSE, CEIS, Personnel) Phone: (801) 538-7724 Neil Stevens (FTFL, Preschool) Phone: (801) 538-7819	Extended Year for Special Educators (EYSE) Stipend Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) Report IDEA Part B Funds Application	Qualtrics Utah Grants
Fiscal	Cole Shakespear (Manager) Phone: (801) 538-7576 Neil Stevens (Fiscal Monitoring Team Lead) Phone: (801) 538-7819 Jerry Rogers (Federal Fiscal Accountability) Phone: (801) 538-7579 Cory Erekson (State Fiscal Accountability) Phone: (801) 538-7713	Special Education Fiscal	Fiscal risk self-assessment submitted with IDEA application

Category	USBE Staff	USBE Webpage	Data Portal
Findings of Noncompliance Internal Monitoring Program Improvement Plan	Dana Archuleta Phone: (801) 538-7698 Natalie Fisher Phone: (801) 538-7644 LauraLee Gillespie Phone: (801) 538-7866 Kelsey Gressmen Phone: (801) 538-7585 Janet Hanson Phone: (801) 538-7787	Special Education Compliance	UPIPS
Autism	Tanya Semerad Phone: (801) 538-7726	Autism Disability Category	N/A
Utah Multi-Tiered System of Supports (UMTSS)	Samantha Sego Phone: (801) 538-7902	UMTSS	N/A