

# UTAH FFY 2019 PART B INDICATOR 17 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (APR)

## Section A: Data Analysis

---

### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Utah's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is to increase the number of students with disabilities (SWD) with Speech Language Impairment (SLI) or Specific Learning Disability (SLD) in grades 6–8 who are proficient on the Readiness Improvement Success Empowerment (RISE) statewide end-of-level mathematics assessment by 0.25 standard deviation over ten years (or a target proficiency rate of 10.95% by 2022–2023).

### Has the SiMR Changed Since the Last SSIP Submission?

No.

### Progress Toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

**Baseline Data:** 1,274 9.990%

### Has the SiMR Target Changed Since the Last SSIP Submission?

No.

**FFY 2018 Target:** 1,274 9.990%      **FFY 2018 Data:** 1,274 9.990%

**FFY 2019 Target:** 1,292 10.13%      **FFY 2019 Data:** N/A

### Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met?

No.

### Did Slippage<sup>1</sup> Occur?

No.

### Did the State Identify Any Data Quality Concerns, Unrelated to COVID-19, That Affected Progress Toward the SiMR During the Reporting Period?

No.

---

<sup>1</sup> The definition of slippage: A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target. The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
  - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
  - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
  - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
  - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

## Did the State Identify Any Data Quality Concerns Directly Related to the COVID-19 Pandemic During the Reporting Period?

Yes.

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity, and reliability for the indicator; an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

- 1) Due to the Spring 2020 soft closure of schools (meaning instruction was still provided but only virtually), the March federal assessment waiver, and other impacts of COVID-19, Utah has no data with which to calculate progress toward the SiMR for students from 2019 to 2020. (There is no statewide assessment data.) Therefore, completeness, validity, or reliability measures are not applicable.
- 2) Due to the Spring 2020 soft closure of schools, the March federal assessment waiver, and other impacts of COVID-19, Utah could collect no data and thus could not calculate progress toward the SiMR for students from 2019 to 2020.

Though Utah has no statewide assessment data with which to evaluate progress on the SiMR, Utah did continue to work with local education agencies (LEAs) that were implementing SSIP initiatives to collect applicable formative data that would help the LEAs and the state evaluate implementation of the evidence-based practices (EBPs) used to implement the SSIP. A few LEAs were able to collect some formative data from their SSIP initiatives. However, the formative assessment measures varied making aggregation of data not feasible.

For example, participants in the co-teaching initiative respond to three surveys during the PL event to ensure they are mastering the math content so they can in turn provide the content to students, but because of the increased workload related to juggling virtual and in-person learning, etc., few surveys were returned.

Provo School District's (PSD's) data is reviewed on p. 5 as an example of the LEA formative data that was collected.

- 3) Because Utah's Governor ordered a two-week soft closure on Friday, March 13, 2020, then extended the soft closure for the rest of the school year shortly thereafter, there was no time in which to take steps to mitigate the impact on data collection.

In the February 22, 2021, Letter to Chiefs, the U.S. Department of Education specifically stated, "Certainly, we do not believe that if there are places where students are unable to attend school safely in person because of the pandemic that they should be brought into school buildings for the sole purpose of taking a test." Students in Utah have experienced and are experiencing COVID-related soft school closures, modified schedules, and hybrid or distance learning models. Due to these compounding factors, Utah expects reduced participation rates, impacting data completeness, validity, and reliability of the Spring 2021 assessment data as well. However, Utah expects to have statewide assessment data for FFY 2020 as Utah has consistently messaged the importance of student participation in assessment for the 2020–2021 school year.

## Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis, and Evaluation

---

### Is the State's Theory of Action New or Revised Since the Previous Submission?

No.

### Did the State Implement Any *New* (Previously or Newly Identified) Infrastructure Improvement Strategies During the Reporting Period?

Yes.

If "Yes," describe each *new* (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

The Utah State Board of Education (Utah) implemented three new strategies: 1) the creation of an EBP Guide for math intervention, based on the Utah three-tiered math framework; 2) the creation of a part-time state Math Equity Specialist position; and 3) math coaching for LEAs that did not meet Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 3 math proficiency targets.

The EBP Guide will support general and special education teachers as they identify students for specific academic interventions and appropriately implement the interventions. The short-term outcome has been to ensure all Utah state agency staff have a shared understanding of the word "intervention" in a math context and the applicable evidence base. Utah is also developing a comprehensive EBP Guide dissemination plan.

The Math Equity Specialist focuses on improving achievement for SWD by increasing mathematics content knowledge and pedagogy of teachers. The short-term outcome has been a renewed statewide focus on ensuring SWD have equitable access to math content and interventions.

The math coaches meet monthly with LEA staff to review data and develop and implement improvement plans and will eventually align them to the EBP Guide. Each LEA determines its own plan; the math coaches support the plan by providing resources, professional learning (PL), and technical assistance (TA). The short-term outcomes are: 1) administrator evaluation of the efficiency and efficacy of the math instruction provided to SWD, and 2) increased teacher understanding of math content, instruction, and intervention.

### Provide a Summary of Each Infrastructure Improvement Strategy That the State Continued to Implement in the Reporting Period Including the Short-Term or Intermediate Outcomes Achieved.

Utah's Theory of Action began with the identification of the three root cause concerns for the poor achievement of SWD in math. The concerns were transformed into three Coherent Improvement Strategies including High Expectations and Beliefs, Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction, and MTSS in Secondary Settings. Utah agency staff facilitated the implementation of each previously identified improvement activity by meeting monthly to discuss progress and problem solve the removal of barriers. Utah also reviewed progress and barriers with stakeholders to solicit feedback and further collaboration (see Section C).

There are several impactful short-term outcomes of the continued implementation of Utah's three coherent improvement strategies.

**High Expectations:**

- 1) 25 teachers participated in a virtual book study on *Mathematical Mindsets*, by Jo Boaler.
- 2) 250 parents participated in a virtual book study on *Grit*, by Angela Duckworth.

**Content and Instruction:**

- 1) Utah provided almost 40 PL events to general and special education LEA and Institute of Higher Education (IHE) participants to improve implementation of evidence-based math instruction and intervention for SWD. (Many events were cancelled due to COVID-19, so the planned number was considerably higher.)
- 2) 128 educators and administrators participated in a PL experience using the online Canvas platform based on the book *High Leverage Practices for Inclusive Classrooms*, by the CEEDAR Center to improve their school's instruction and intervention related to the SiMR.
- 3) 125 teachers participated in the co-teaching initiative.
- 4) Utah disseminated nine monthly articles through listservs to about 200 administrators and 700 teachers on improving math outcomes for SWD.
- 5) Utah disseminated a quarterly co-teaching newsletter to support the 125 co-teachers (to refrain from pulling them out of classrooms to participate in PL).
- 6) 54 LEAs participated in an Indicator 3 data analysis and improvement planning PL experience.
- 7) Five LEAs participated in a year-long Indicator 3 coaching experience.

**MTSS:**

- 1) 64 educators and administrators participated in the MTSS in Math online Canvas course.

In addition, Utah has continued to improve our agency's movement along the Collaboration Continuum. (The levels least to greatest are Contact, Cooperation, Coordination, Collaboration and Convergence). In the Infrastructure Analysis done for Phase I, Utah staff agreed that cross-department work was limited to specific projects and specific specialists, leading to consensus that most Utah work was happening at the Contact level, but a few efforts had moved into the Cooperation level. Since the implementation of the SSIP in Phase II, which has successfully created resources, reviewed data, and planned and provided PL and TA, Utah is creating a comprehensive tiered system of supports for LEAs and believes we are consistently operating at the Collaboration Level which demonstrates significant growth.

**Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy.**

Utah's evaluation plan for the SSIP has two major parts. The first is the SiMR target calculation, which is outlined in Section A and is reported in the *EMAPS* tool. As the U.S. Department of Education issued a waiver for the 2019–2020 statewide assessment due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Utah cannot report on the first part of the SiMR target calculation.

The second part of the evaluation is the periodic evaluation of the components within each of the three Coherent Improvement Strategies including High Expectations, Content and Instruction, and MTSS. Utah evaluated the outcomes of the improvement strategies by 1) evaluating and adding to the infrastructure improvements needed to better support the implementation of the SSIP (see p. 3), 2)

comparing the outputs from previous SSIP implementation years with the current year's outputs (see p. 4), 3) reviewing the output/outcome data of LEAs that have been implementing SSIP-implementation initiatives (see below), and 4) reviewing activities and progress with stakeholders (see p. 8). Most of Utah's data is related to outputs, as opposed to outcomes, but the fact that educators and administrators continued to collaborate with us to review and improve practices, supports Utah's decision to continue implementing these strategies.

### **LEA Example:**

One LEA's formative SSIP implementation data Utah reviewed was PSD. In September of 2019, PSD began conversing with Utah about possible ways to increase their mathematics proficiency scores for their SWD in 10<sup>th</sup> grade. PSD decided to implement a co-teaching model in middle and high school. This was a huge change as PSD had largely only provided SWD mathematics instruction in special classes.

PSD administrators from each school met to ensure support for the new model for serving SWD in mathematics. PSD administrators sent all the secondary special and general education teachers that would be participating in co-teaching in the fall of 2020 to a math PL that provided many strategies to engage all students in the instruction. The teachers gained so much from the presenter they invited her to provide district PL in the summer and then again just before the school year began.

PSD now has SWD in general education mathematics classes who had not been in a general education class for several years. PSD teachers administer the Houghton Mifflin Mathematics Inventory to the SWD three times a year and have done so for several years.

The short-term outcome of PSD's initiative was an average increase of 30 quantile points per SWD across two high schools (33 SWD) in just the first semester of implementation, compared with the previous semester's results. In addition, teachers reported SWD now had access to 1) grade-appropriate Core instruction, 2) a highly qualified math teacher, and 3) instruction with non-disabled peers which is increasing the expectations of the SWD for their learning and content mastery.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Utah's SSIP is continuing to be implemented through FFY20 under the leadership of the Math Equity Specialist. The Theory of Action's improvement strategies of High Expectations, Content and Instruction, and MTSS are being impacted through statewide and targeted PL and TA. Utah anticipates seeing impact from the three new infrastructure improvement activities as well as our continuing activities.

### **High Expectations:**

- 1) Utah is providing another parent book study in FFY20 on *Grit* by Angela Duckworth. The anticipated outcome is increased awareness of the need for parents to have high expectations for their SWD and to require their IEPs articulate support for those expectations with rigorous goals and appropriate services and placement.

### **Content and Instruction:**

- 1) The EBP Guide will be finalized and disseminated in FFY20 and extensive PL and TA will be provided as it is rolled out to LEAs and other stakeholders. An anticipated outcome is an increase in the use of EBPs in math and a decrease in the use of practices without an evidence-base,

leading to improved student proficiency as measured by the statewide end-of-level math assessment.

- 2) Utah anticipates that a longer-term outcome of the work of the Math Equity Specialist will be an increase in the number of special education teachers becoming state-qualified in math content and interventions. This will be measured by calculating the number and percentage of special education teachers who have a special education math endorsement.
- 3) As LEAs that did not meet APR Indicator 3 targets access PL, TA, and ongoing coaching to improve math instruction, intervention, and programming, Utah anticipates the math proficiency scores of SWD in these LEAs to increase.
- 4) In addition, Utah has and will continue to provide an annual co-teaching initiative cohort. As more general education and special education teachers are trained to plan and facilitate instruction and intervention together, more SWD will be able to access and master grade-level content, leading to improved proficiency.

#### **MTSS:**

- 1) Utah has created an Equity-Based MTSS Canvas course that will be released for participation in late FFY20. The anticipated outcome is for educators to effectively implement MTSS, giving students increased access to grade-appropriate content and the EBPs needed to be successful.

Based on discussions with Utah's stakeholders, they agree that the improvement activities currently being implemented are appropriate to impact the SiMR and to improve math outcomes for SWD.

#### **Did the State Implement Any *New* (Previously or Newly Identified) Evidence-Based Practices?**

No

#### **Provide a Summary of the *Continued* Evidence-Based Practices and How the Evidence-Based Practices are Intended to Impact the SiMR.**

Utah has continued to provide LEAs with PL and TA about EBPs for math including distributing resources from national repositories (What Works Clearinghouse, American Institute for Research, and Evidence for ESSA) to ensure SWD have access to the content and the interventions they need to master it.

Utah has also shared resources with LEAs regarding multi-tiered supports from the National Center on Systemic Improvement, the National Center on Intensive Interventions, and the National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance at the Institute of Education Sciences.

Utah provided EBPs PL that included implementation of:

- Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework
- Five anchors of differentiation into the Standards for Mathematical Practices
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) Teaching Practices
- Coherence Map and Utah Core Guides
- Tasks using the Comprehensive Mathematics Instruction Framework to improve task-based instruction, increase content knowledge, and develop student self-awareness and identity in math
- Student interviews and collaborative study

Decreasing ineffective practices such as within-class grouping, ability grouping, retention, extending a math course over two years, and low expectations is as important as implementing EBPs. Utah continues to be concerned that these ineffective practices have led to SWD taking off-grade-level mathematics courses and assessments. As LEAs implement EBPs and discontinue the use of ineffective practices, SWD will have more equitable access to grade-level Core content.

### **Describe the Data Collected to Evaluate and Monitor Fidelity of Implementation and to Assess Practice Change.**

Utah is measuring the fidelity of implementation of the activities Utah is facilitating. For example, Utah is providing PL and TA for a co-teaching initiative as introduced above. Each co-teaching team consisting of a general educator and a special educator is observed by instructional coaches at least twice during the year to provide the teams with feedback about their practice. The coaches look for the implementation of grade-appropriate content, evidence-based co-teaching model implementation, as well as EBPs in math and then debrief the teams about how to increase the use and impact of EBPs. (However, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, not all observations were conducted.) Further, participants in the co-teaching initiative respond to three surveys during the PL event to ensure they are mastering the math content so they can in turn provide the content to students. (Again, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, very few surveys were returned.) In this way, the co-teaching initiative can ensure the teams are implementing with fidelity. As providing the initiative's PL and TA virtually has been surprisingly successful, virtual options will continue to be provided to participants so that there is greater access to the initiative.

Another example of Utah's fidelity measurement is the use of exit surveys to measure the knowledge and skill gain of each participant in PL activities outlined in the Infrastructure Improvement Strategy section above. Exit surveys show consistent increases in knowledge gain, but also articulate areas that need strengthening in future PL experiences.

### **Describe the Components (Professional Development Activities, Policies/ Procedures Revisions, and/or Practices, etc.) Implemented During the Reporting Period to Support the Knowledge and Use of Selected Evidence-Based Practices.**

The components Utah implemented to support the knowledge and use of the EBPs included in-person and virtual PL experiences, multi-session virtual book studies, asynchronous Canvas courses, a multi-session knowledge and skill co-teaching initiative, educator newsletter articles, administrator newsletter articles, individual LEA coaching for math instruction and intervention program improvement, and TA.

Utah outlined the short-term outcomes of the improvement activities to implement EBPs on p. 4.

Because LEAs develop or select their own formative assessments and fidelity measures for their SSIP-implementation initiatives, Utah will continue to provide guidance on assessing the reliability and validity of these measures and interpreting findings, particularly if the outcomes reported by LEAs using these measures do not correlate with the statewide assessment data, when it is available.

## Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

---

### Describe the Specific Strategies Implemented to Engage Stakeholders in Key Improvement Efforts.

A state team is responsible for ensuring the SSIP is implemented and also reviews the strategy evaluation data. State team membership is made up of individuals from sections across the agency including Teaching and Learning, Assessment, Student Support (Counseling, Equity, Prevention, Adult Education, Youth in Custody, Federal Programs, etc.), Digital Teaching and Learning, the State Personnel Development Grant which focuses on MTSS, and also includes a representative from the UCTM. Utah disseminated SSIP implementation information through the PL and TA provided to LEAs including in conferences, newsletters, book studies, the co-teaching initiative, and during coaching.

Even through the COVID-19 pandemic, the state team continued to meet with stakeholders including other state agencies and education- and disability-advocacy organizations to support infrastructure improvements, EBP implementation, and solicit feedback by inviting stakeholders to attend state-led discussions and also by attending the meetings of the different stakeholder groups.

In FFY19, those stakeholders included:

- LEA Special Education Directors
- Utah Special Education Advisory Panel (USEAP) members
- Utah State Board of Education Committees
- Utah Legislative Committees
- Utah Parent Center
- LEA Curriculum and Assessment Directors
- LEA Preschool Coordinators
- LEA administrators (including Superintendents, Charter School Directors, and building administrators)
- Staff from relevant special education, school psychology, and speech pathology programs at Utah IHEs
- Baby Watch/Early Intervention (Utah's Part C agency)
- Agencies that provide services to SWD (such as Juvenile Justice Services, Vocational Rehabilitation, the Division of Child and Family Services, the Department of Health, Division of Services for People with Disabilities, Workforce Services, etc.)
- Utah Educators
- Utah Parent Teacher Association
- Utah Coordinating Council for People with Disabilities
- UCTM
- Utah Council for Exceptional Children
- Utah Math Coordinators
- Utah Coaching Institute

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

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

No

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response.

N/A