Applicant Assurances

Print this sheet, complete and sign the spaces at the bottom, scan, and attach to the electronic application.

The Board Chair must sign the following agreement prior to submitting the application package.

Should the agreement be signed by someone other than the current Board Chair, the application package will be deemed Administratively Incomplete.

School Name: Utah Connections Academy

The Applicant certifies all information contained in this application is complete and accurate, realizing that any misrepresentation could result in disqualification from the Expansion Application process or revocation after award.

The Applicant understands that applications must be received by SCSB staff no later than 1 July for the next school year and that late/incomplete applications will not be considered.

The Applicant acknowledges that all information presented in the application package, if approved, becomes part of the charter and will be used for accountability purposes throughout the term of the charter.

The Applicant acknowledges that the charter school governing board has read all Utah statutes regarding charter schools and that the Applicant is subject to and in compliance with all relevant federal, state and local laws, and requirements.

The Applicant acknowledges that the most current academic data will be provided to the SCSB for its consideration of the application.

The Applicant acknowledges that prior to inclusion on the agenda, the SCSB recommends charter school governing boards schedule an appointment with SCSB staff to discuss the Expansion Application and provide clarification to any staff questions. Appointments can be scheduled by emailing james.madsen@schools.utah.gov.

The applicant certifies that the entire Expansion Application was submitted to the Utah Connections Academy Board of Directors on June 21, 2017.

Stephanie Kinney   _____
Name of Board Chair   Signature of Board Chair /Date

School Entity Information

Name of School: **Utah Connections Academy**

Name of School Administrator: **Jeffery Herr, School Principal**

Local School District: **N/A – Utah Connections Academy is authorized under state law by the Utah State Charter School Board. Administrative Offices are located in Davis School District.**

Provide a statement describing the mission of the new school: **Utah Connections Academy (UCA) is a pioneering virtual public charter school whose mission is to maximize academic achievement for students in grades K-12 throughout the state of Utah who need an alternative to the traditional classroom.**

Below, list the names and positions of all current Board Members (officers, members, directors, partners), and their positions. Also list any other current charters in which they act as a corporate principal or charter representative. Add rows as necessary.

Name	Position	Current Charter Affiliations
Stephanie Kinney	Board President/ Board Chair	N/A
Megan Ellis	Board Treasurer/Budget Officer	N/A
Debbie Dye	Board Secretary	N/A
Kaydee Phillips	Board Member	N/A
Gretchen Brown	Board Member	N/A

Required Exhibits:

- Minutes of the board of the sponsoring school authorizing application for Expansion.

Please see included Board Minutes.

Population and Enrollment

☒ By checking this box, I understand and agree that the enrollment policies must be consistent with state law and Board rule, and that increased enrollment of students cannot begin until the Expansion Application is approved.

Grade Levels to be Served: K-12

Projected Maximum Enrollment: 2,000

Note: When completing the table, be sure to indicate the school year in the box labeled SY. Schools are listed as SY with the two-digit year for the end of the year. For example: SY17 is the 2016-2017 school year. Start with the year you wish to begin the expansion. Please do not leave any boxes blank. If you do not plan to include a grade place a 0 in the box.

	Grades and Specific Number of Students Served by Grade													**Max Enrollment**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SY 19	35	40	35	55	45	70	95	100	145	265	175	150	90	1,300
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SY 20	40	45	40	65	55	80	120	130	180	330	220	185	110	1,600
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SY 21	50	55	50	80	65	95	145	165	225	415	280	235	140	2,000

Note from UCA: Please note that the number of students in each grade is considered a guideline and not a cap for the specific grade.

Attach a clear, specific and concise response about the proposed target population. The expected page length for all five questions is no more than two pages.

1. Describe the population of the school that includes a demographic profile listing the percentage of minority students, the percentage of students with disabilities qualifying for special education services, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, the percentage of English Learners, academic performance of students entering the school, and distance travelled by current students.

2. Compare the description in question one (1) to the local school district of the sponsoring school.

3. Describe the market analysis that supports the successful enrollment of the projected student count from the target population. Include what makes this school unique or needed.

4. Describe the enrollment practices, processes, and policies of the school.

5. Describe the enrollment timeframe that will be implemented and shared with the public.

Please see included Proposed Target Population.

Facilities

Does this expansion of student enrollment require a new facility or a significant structural change to an existing facility?

☐ Yes (Complete Section A)

☒ No (Skip Section A)

Section A: Facilities Plan for Expansion

Attach the following information regarding the new facility or structural change.

A-1. Attach renderings or describe the facility size and layout suitable for implementing the Educational Plan. If renderings are not available, provide the date when the documents will be submitted to SCSB staff.

A-2. Describe the timeline for completion of the facility by the start date.

A-3. Describe the financing requirements needed for this facility project. As required by statute, submit all contracts to SCSB prior to entering into any facility contracts.

Educational Plan

Attach a clear, specific, and concise response regarding the Educational Plan. The expected page length for all questions is approximately two pages.

☒ By checking this box, I understand and agree that the Educational Plan must be consistent with and fully aligned to the Utah Core standards. Please describe deviations in the narrative, if applicable.

1. Provide a description of philosophical approach to improving pupil achievement used.

2. Describe the program of instruction used, including methods of instruction and curriculum for the core academic content areas, which supports the school's philosophy and aligns to Utah Core Standards.

3. Describe how the school provides, as required by state and federal law, special education and related services.

4. If the school serves or intends to expand to serve a high school population, identify the graduation requirements for the school that will meet State requirements. Describe the process and criteria for awarding course credit.

5. List the *Contractual Agreement Goals* of the sponsoring school and describe the school's performance against the goals. Include goals identified in the Charter Fidelity Monitoring Report (if charter agreement signed prior to June 2016) or Exhibit A (if charter agreement was signed in June 2016 or later). If the school is not meeting all of its goals, describe the governing board's corrective action plan.

Required Exhibit:

- RDA scoring letters and EPR letters.
- Executive summaries from UPIPS review for the past three years, if applicable.

Please see included Educational Plan and Special Education Exhibit.

Business Plan

A school that receives one or more "Falls Far Below Standard" and/or two or more "Does Not Meet Standard" on the CSPS Financial Performance measure does not meet the SCSB's expectations and must submit additional information as part of its application.

Does the financial performance of the sponsoring school meet the SCSB's financial performance expectations?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If no, Required Attachments:

- **Financial Performance Information**: In a detailed, yet concise response, address each Financial Performance metric where the school received a "Falls Far Below Standard" or "Does Not Meet Standard."

Please see included Business Plan

Minutes of the Board Authorizing Application

Utah Connections Academy
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. MT

Held at the following location and via teleconference:
687 West 700 South, Suite D
Woods Cross, UT 84087

I.   Call to Order

Ms. Kinney called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. when all participants were present and able to hear each other. The school facility was open to the public to attend, and a phone line at that location was open for the call as well.

II.   Roll Call

Board Members Present: Stephanie Kinney, Debbie Dye, Gretchen Brown and Kaydee Philips (all via phone);

Board Members Absent: Megan Ellis;

Guests Present: Jeff Herr, School Leader (in person); Jay W. Ragley, Josh Daniels, Jennifer Dukek, Ben Shifflet and Laura Coleman, Connections staff (all via phone).

III.   Public Comment

There were no public comments at this time.

IV.   Routine Business

a.   Approval of Agenda

Ms. Kinney asked the Board to review the Agenda distributed prior to the meeting. She then asked if there were any requested changes to the Agenda. There being no changes noted, the following motion was made by Ms. Dye and seconded by Ms. Phillips as follows:

RESOLVED, that the Agenda for the June 21, 2017 Utah Connections Academy Board of Directors Annual Meeting, as presented, is hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

V.   Oral Reports

a.   School Leader's Report

i.   Graduation and End of Year Activities Update

Mr. Herr discussed the recent graduation ceremony, including numbers of graduates. He also discussed the school's end of year activities for staff and upcoming Leadership Retreat.

ii.   Audit Updates

Mr. Herr reviewed the recent audit updates with the Board.

iii.   Enrollment and Hiring Update

Mr. Herr advised the Board of the number of students currently enrolled for the upcoming school year, as well as those in the pre-enrollment stages. He further provided the Board with an update on changes to staff composition based on enrollment.

b.   Financial Report

Mr. Shifflet reviewed the financial materials included in the Board materials in detail. He reviewed the changes in the financials and the forecasted expenses since last month's statements, enrollment funding, projected fund balance and specific expenses. He further reviewed the revised budget as included in the Board materials for consideration within the Consent Agenda.

VI.   Consent Agenda

Ms. Kinney asked the Board Members whether there were any items from the Consent Agenda that they wanted moved to Action Items for discussion, or tabled. Ms. Kinney requested to add the Board President to Consent Item (f) Approval of Board Treasurer Advancing Funds for Payment of Connections Invoice(s), in the event the Board Treasurer is not available. There being no discussion or further changes noted, a motion was made by Ms. Phillips and seconded by Ms. Brown as follows:

RESOLVED, the Consent Items:

a. Approval of Minutes from the May 17, 2017 Board Meeting;
b. Approval of Staffing Report;
c. Approval of Fast ForWord Invoice(s);
d. Approval of Board Meeting Schedule for the 2017-2018 School Year;
e. Approval of Revision(s) to the Special Education Policies and Procedures Manual;
f. Approval of Board Treasurer and Board President Advancing Funds for Payment of Connections Invoice(s); and
g. Approval of Revised Budget for the 2016-2017 School Year; are hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

VII.   Action Items

a.   Approval of Connections Academy of Utah, LLC Invoice for May

Ms. Kinney reviewed the invoice for the month of June, as drawn from the financial report reviewed earlier in the meeting and included with the Board materials. She noted that Ms. Ellis had advised that she reviewed the invoice and found it to be in order. Ms. Kinney asked the Board members whether they had any questions on the invoice or if any items required further explanation. There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Dye and seconded by Ms. Phillips as follows:

RESOLVED, that the May invoice, in the amount of $617,398.35, as presented, is hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

b.   Approval of Statement of Agreement (SOA) with Connections

Ms. Kinney reviewed the progress completed to date by all parties involved in updating the Statement of Agreement (SOA) with Connections. The Board expressed support of the SOA. There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Phillips and seconded by Ms. Brown as follows:

RESOLVED, that the Statement of Agreement (SOA) with Connections, as presented, is hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

c.   Approval of Application for Enrollment Expansion and Appointment of Board Chair as Board Designee to Finalize and Submit all Related Documentation

Ms. Kinney reviewed the benefits in submitting an Application for Enrollment Expansion to the Utah State Charter School Board (SCSB) and the progress completed to date. The Board expressed support of the requested Expansion Application and appointing the Board Chair as Board Designee to finalize and submit all related documentation. There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Phillips and seconded by Ms. Brown as follows:

RESOLVED, that the Application for Enrollment Expansion and Appointment of Board Chair as Board Designee to Finalize and Submit all Related Documentation, as presented, is hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

d.   Approval of the 2017-2018 School Year Budget and Fee Schedule from Connections Academy of Utah, LLC

Ms. Kinney reminded the Board of the Financial Report earlier in the meeting and reviewed the proposed 2017-2018 school year budget outline and Budget Notes documents with the Board as included in the Board meeting materials. Ms. Kinney further reminded the Board of the budget development process to date that included the school leader, Board Treasurer and Connections staff. She advised the Board that the accompanying 2017-2018 Fee Schedule being presented summarizes the basis for all charges from Connections to the school within the Statement of Agreement (SOA), and that the basis for all charges is drawn directly from the Budget. There being no further discussion, Ms. Dye made the following motion and it was seconded by Ms. Phillips as follows:

RESOLVED, that the 2017-2018 school year Budget and Fee Schedule from Connections Academy of Utah, LLC, as presented, is hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

e.   Approval of Directors

Ms. Coleman advised the Board that one (1) Board member's term is up for renewal at this meeting, Kaydee Phillips. Following her confirmation that she wished to continue on the Board, discussion was held on the renewal of her term. There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Phillips and seconded by Ms. Brown as follows:

RESOLVED, that the appointment of Kaydee Phillips to the Utah Connections Academy Board of Directors, as a Class 1 Director, for a term of three (3) years to the 2020 Annual meeting, as discussed, is hereby approved.

The motion was approved unanimously.

f.   Approval of Officers for the 2017-2018 School Year

Ms. Coleman presented this item to the Board. She reviewed with the Board each Officer position as set out in the Board-adopted Bylaws, and advised the Board that all positions would be for a term until the Annual Meeting 2018. Nominations were opened for each position. Following the closure of nominations, and there being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Dye and seconded by Ms. Brown as follows:

RESOLVED, that the appointment of:

        Kaydee Phillips, Board Secretary, as discussed, is hereby approved.

The motion was approved unanimously.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Dye and seconded by Ms. Phillips as follows:

RESOVLED, that the appointment of:

        Stephanie Kinney, Board President; and
        Megan Ellis, Board Treasurer, as discussed, are hereby approved.

The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII.   Information Items

a.   State Relations Update

Mr. Daniels provided the Board with an update on recent legislative activities that may impact the school.

b.   Partner School Leadership Team (PSLT) Update

Ms. Dukek presented this item to the Board on behalf of Connections' School Leadership Team.

        i.   Program Manager Services in 2017-2018 Update

        Ms. Dukek reviewed the school support to be provided by Connections for the 2017-2018 school year, including the roles of the Partner School Leadership Team (PSLT) and Program Manager. She further explained that the new Program Manager role will be to assist the School Leader with operations, processes and addressing school needs that require interfacing with other departments.

c.   Results of Parent Satisfaction Survey

Mr. Herr reviewed the results of the Parent Satisfaction Survey, included in the Board materials, in detail with the Board. He noted that a third party independent vendor conducted the survey. A copy of the results of the survey was sent to the school Board's President directly from the third-party vendor. The Board discussed the Parent Satisfaction Survey in detail with Mr. Herr.

d.   Board Recruitment Update

Ms. Coleman provided the Board with an update on Ms. Dye's desire to resign from the Board once a new potential Board member has been identified. Board members discussed current Board composition, as well as their preferred background and credentials for the next candidate for the Board.

IX.   EXECUTIVE SESSION – Personnel Matter – Utah Code §§ 52-4-205(1)(a) – to discuss an individual's character and professional competence

The Board entered into executive session at 6:04 p.m. upon a motion made by Ms. Dye, seconded by Ms. Phillips and confirmed via a roll call vote of all Board members present to discuss a Personnel Matter - Utah Code §§ 52-4-205(1)(a) – to discuss an individual's character and professional competence. Board members present were: Stephanie Kinney, Debbie Dye, Kaydee Phillips and Gretchen Brown. Guests present were: Jennifer Dukek and Laura Coleman. All others left the meeting at this time.

After the Board concluded their discussion, the Board resumed their open session at 6:22 p.m. upon a motion made by Ms. Phillips, seconded by Ms. Dye and confirmed via roll call vote of all Board members present. No action was taken during executive session.

X.   Approval of Action(s) Necessary Based on Executive Session

a.   Approval of School Leader Compensation for the 2017-2018 School Year

Ms. Kinney presented this item to the Board, noting discussion during Executive Session. There being no further discussion, Mr. Phillips made the following motion and Ms. Dye seconded as follows:

RESOLVED, that the School Leader compensation for the 2017-2018 school year in the amount of $103,020 with a 15% bonus potential, as presented, is hereby approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

XI.   Adjournment and Confirmation of Meeting - Wednesday, August 16, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. MT

Ms. Kinney noted that the Board was at the end of its agenda and that the next meeting is scheduled for August 16, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. MT. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Phillips, seconded by Ms. Dye, and carried unanimously the meeting was adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

Proposed Target Population

1.   Describe the population of the school that includes a demographic profile listing the percentage of minority students, the percentage of students with disabilities qualifying for special education services, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, the percentage of English Learners, academic performance of students entering the school, and distance travelled by current students.

In 2015-16, our student population was 47% male and 53% female. Five percent of the school was gifted, while slightly more than 13% qualified for special education. For 2016-17, our student population is 54.0% female and 46% male. Four percent of the school is gifted, while almost 13% qualify for special education. We provide additional demographic breakdowns, as requested. Additionally, UCA serves a variety of special needs and low income students, who might not have had a personalized education elsewhere. The breakdowns presented are from the 2015-16 and 2016-17 Enrollment Counts, each dated October 1.

Percentage of UCA Minority Students:	15-16	16-17		15-16	16-17
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.7%	1.2%			
Asian	0.9%	1.3%	**Percentage of Students with Disabilities:**		
Black, Non-Hispanic	1.6%	2.2%		13.5%	12.7%
Hispanic	11.7%	11.9%	**Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students:**		
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0.7%	2.3%		42.9%	35.7%
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	3.8%	1.4%	**Percentage of English Language Learners:**		
Total	**19.4%**	**20.1%**		0.2%	0.5%

Academic Performance of Students Entering the School: Given that student state test scores from a prior school year were not available for newly enrolled 2016-17 students, UCA is presenting the Longitudinal Evaluation of Academic Progress (LEAP) pretest assessment. This test, a Connections Education formative assessment aligned to state standards, is used as a measure of academic performance for incoming students at UCA. For new students entering the school, 13.2% (N=296) scored proficient on the Math LEAP pretest and 21.1% (N=229) scored proficient on the Reading LEAP pretest.

Distance Travelled by Current Students: UCA is a virtual school. Our students do not have to travel daily.

2.   Compare the description in question one (1) to the local school district of the sponsoring school.

UCA is not sponsored by a local school district. It is authorized under state law by the Utah State Charter School Board. We used state demographics from the 2015-16 and 2016-17 Enrollment Counts, dated October 1. Typically, UCA reflects the makeup of the state of Utah. In comparison with the state, UCA, on average, serves more economically disadvantaged students, as well as more students with disabilities, as shown in the tables presented in Questions 1 and 2.

Percentage of Utah Minority Students:	15-16	16-17		15-16	16-17
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.2%	1.1%	**Percentage of Students with Disabilities:**		
Asian	1.6%	1.4%		11.3%	11.4%
Black, Non-Hispanic	1.4%	1.7%	**Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students:**		
Hispanic	16.6%	16.8%		35.6%	34.7%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	1.6%	2.5%	**Percentage of English Language Learners:**		
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	2.8%	1.6%		6.4%	6.2%

3.   Describe the market analysis that supports the successful enrollment of the projected student count from the target population. Include what makes this school unique or needed.

In 2016, the U.S. Census Bureau declared Utah the fastest-growing state in the country[1]. With consistently high birth rates and an uptick in migration driven by high economic growth[2], Utah's local district schools are becoming overpopulated[3] (ex. Alpine, Jordan[4,5,6]) with 644,476 total K-12 students statewide[7]. Utah has the fourth fastest-growing population with a 9.9% population gain since 2010, as well as continued high birth rates. The National Center for Education Statistics projects that from 2014 to 2026, the K-12 school population in Utah will grow 18.1%, the third-fastest in the United States.

Enrollment in full-time virtual schools in 2016-17 was at least 8,500 students and has increased steadily from around 3,300 in the 2012-13 school year. Additionally, before closing at the end of the 2016-17 school year, Utah's Electronic High School served at least 7,000 students, indicating need for virtual schooling options. Currently, Utah reports that about 1.3% of the K-12 population is enrolled in full-time virtual schools. That number could see a significant increase in the next few years in the wake of the closure of the Electronic High School.

In other states with similarly-sized K-12 student populations, larger shares of students are enrolling in full-time virtual schools: 2% in Oklahoma and 2.2% in Oregon. Given Utah's recent technology boom and the expected rise in K-12 population, Utah may see greater adoption of full-time virtual learning by students.

UCA offers the following unique features: a highly effective teacher model; a multi-tiered Intervention Approach; and a track record with underserved populations.

4.	Describe the enrollment practices, processes, and policies of the school.

Prior to enrolling in UCA, the school will request copies of prior state achievement test scores, but will not require them as a condition of enrollment. Parents/Guardians are required to sign a statement of assurance that their student is only enrolled in one public school.

Minimum and Maximum Ages

- A child may enroll in kindergarten if the child is at least 5 years of age on or before September 1
- A child may enroll in first grade if the child turns 6 years of age on or before September 1

The maximum enrollment age may also vary by student, dependent upon on the program in which a student is enrolled. The maximum age limits are:

- General education students who turn 18 on or before September 1st
- Students who receive special education and related services who turn 21 on or before September 1st

5.	Describe the enrollment timeframe that will be implemented and shared with the public.

As in previous years, enrollment will begin on March 1, 2018. If a lottery is needed, it will be determined on April 6, 2018. If a lottery is needed, it will be held on April 13, 2018. For grades K-11, students not enrolled by December 1 will be asked to wait to enroll until the second semester. Students enrolling in grade 12 usually have a deadline on/around November 1 for enrollment. Enrollment typically closes by the end of March. The public website will list the date that enrollment closes for that school year, if applicable. Additional outreach will include broad reach media channels covering all geographies as well as reaching out to diverse students and families. The campaign will include sharing information through direct mail, information sessions, UCA's website, telephone/e-mail information service, media outreach, referrals/word of mouth, and search engines and social media.

---

[1] https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2016/cb16-214.html
[2] http://www.ksl.com/?nid=757&sid=33354952
[3] http://www.ksl.com/index.php?sid=40955953&nid=148&title=utah-districts-hoping-for-new-schools-to-deal-with-capacity-concerns
[4] http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865666932/Utah-public-schools-add-10500-students-in-2016.html
[5] http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865660780/Skyridge-High-School-opens-in-booming-Lehi-with-2350-students-2-and-counting.html
[6] http://www.good4utah.com/news/local-news/population-boom-putting-stress-on-school-district/454459076
[7] http://schools.utah.gov/main/INFORMATION/Online-Newsroom/DOCS/2016/November10.aspx

Educational Plan Exhibit

1.   Provide a description of philosophical approach to improving pupil achievement used.

Utah Connections Academy (UCA) is a fully accredited virtual school program that combines the best online and offline resources to deliver comprehensive, high-quality K–12 online education. With the best resources at their fingertips, UCA students explore and master all required core subjects: language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. UCA provides an asynchronous model that uses synchronous support.[1] Some students thrive with one-on-one attention while others crave the space to work through problems independently at their own pace. Offering a combination of the two learning approaches allows UCA to create a more personalized learning experience that supports different learning styles.

2.   Describe the program of instruction used, including methods of instruction and curriculum for the core academic content areas, which supports the school's philosophy and aligns to Utah Core Standards.

UCA implements the Connections instructional model which incorporates key facets such as 1) the Learning Triad (teachers, Learning Coaches, and curriculum); 2) Counselors; and 3) Student Motivation. This instructional model supports the school's mission and philosophy and is aligned to the Utah Core Standards.

1) *The Learning Triad*:

   a) **Highly Qualified Teachers –** Each student has certified Utah teachers specially trained in teaching in an online environment, the Connections curriculum, and specific instructional methods.

   b) **Supportive Learning Coaches -** Typically, a Learning Coach helps keep students motivated and on track and regularly communicates with the students' teachers.

   c) **A high quality, standards-aligned curriculum -** The Connections curriculum is fully aligned to the Utah Core Standards. The developmentally appropriate curriculum increases its integration of technology as students advance through the grades.

2) *Counselors:* At UCA, Counselors work with students and their families to develop a four year plan, so students can meet their postsecondary goals. Counselors also help to identify students who have gotten off track for graduation and establish a plan for successfully meeting requirements to earn their diploma.

3) *Student Motivation*[2]: Teachers are trained to apply three engagement strategies to their instruction to create a motivational online learning environment: 1) making instruction fun and engaging, 2) providing a safe way to respond, and 3) helping students succeed.

3.   Describe how the school provides, as required by state and federal law, special education and related services.

UCA is committed to providing its students with exceptionalities with equal access to its education program and a free and appropriate public education (FAPE). We provide students with accessibility through resources tailored to each student's individual abilities and needs, including assistive technologies and individualized support. At the time of enrollment, all parents/guardians who indicate their students have special needs are asked to submit a copy of the student's most recent Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Section 504 Plan. All special education documents are reviewed by the Director of Special Education, and if necessary a member of the special education staff contacts the family to discuss specific student needs or to clarify the information. The team notes student's annual review date, and once enrollment is complete the team schedules an IEP team or Section 504 meeting to amend the IEP to reflect implementation in the virtual environment.

At the beginning of the school year, the special education team ensures that teachers have access to the IEPs or Section 504 Plans of the students in their classes. The teachers are made aware of each student's special learning needs and are given guidance on how to make the necessary program accommodations and modifications as described in each student's plan. The school's special education department will work closely

---

[1] http://www.connectionsacademy.com/blog/posts/2014-09-26/Real-Time-or-Anytime-Learning-Synchronous-and-Asynchronous-Learning-Explained.aspx
[2] http://www.connectionsacademy.com/blog/posts/2015-02-11/The-Fundamentals-of-Online-Classroom-Motivation.aspx

with the general education teachers to ensure that every student with an IEP is included with their non-disabled peers and has access to the general education curriculum to the maximum extent possible. Students whose IEP states a need for related services (e.g., speech-language therapy, occupational therapy, etc.) are provided such services virtually first. If the IEP team determines that virtual services are not appropriate, these services are provided face-to-face in a location proximate to the child. Finally, IEP and Section 504 Plan team meetings are typically held virtually. All meetings occur in compliance with all state and federal laws.

4.	If the school serves or intends to expand to serve a high school population, identify the graduation requirements for the school that will meet State requirements. Describe the process and criteria for awarding course credit.

Students must earn a total of 24-27 credits (depending on diploma pathway), pass the state-mandated Civics Exam and pass all other state-mandated proficiency exams or meet alternative requirements as mandated by Utah law. A student with an IEP may receive a certificate of completion rather than a diploma. Depending on his or her disability, a student with an IEP may remain in school until the student turns 22 years old. There are several diploma pathways available to students in UCA: Standard, Honors, and a Diploma with an Emphasis in Technology. Students must earn a 60% (D-) or better in a course in order to earn credit for it.

5.	List the *Contractual Agreement Goals* of the sponsoring school and describe the school's performance against the goals. If the school is not meeting all of its goals, describe the governing board's corrective action plan.

Goal	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Goal 1: The weighted state average of all official published state test proficiency rates for the school will increase annually until they meet or exceed the state average. *(Note. The calculation is a ratio of the school's result to the state average for each tested subject-grade level. Each ratio is capped at 1.00 and a weighted average is computed based on the number of tests taken by students at the school.)*	88.5%	64.7%	77.4%
Goal 2a: UCA's annual attendance rate will meet or exceed the state's overall attendance rate.	100%	93%	100%
Goal 2b: UCA's percentage of full-academic-year (FAY) 12th graders who graduate will increase until the school's official annual cohort graduation rate meets or exceeds the state's graduation rate.	88.2%	72.9%	79.4%
Goal 3: UCA's participation rate in required state tests will increase annually until it meets or exceeds the state's overall participation rate.	Average of 86% participation	Average of 81% participation	Average of 67% participation
Goal 4: UCA students will average a 75% performance metric as measured by the June Monthly School Report, or show annual improvement in that average until it reaches 75%.	71%	80%	78%
Goal 5: Utah Connections Academy will ensure that participating families are satisfied with their children's school experience each school year.	80.1%	83.7%	86.6%

UCA has met Goals 2a, 4, and 5 recently. Goals 1, 2b, and 3 are all part of the effort included in the school's Focus Turnaround School Improvement Plan. UCA's Focus Turnaround School Improvement Plan is attached as a supplemental exhibit, along with the most recent quarterly report. In October 2015, UCA was designated as a Turnaround School. UCA elected to partner with Innovations Educational Consulting (IEC) to develop new goals and an implementation plan. The plan includes numerous strategies such as focused professional development; rigorous Tier 1 instruction; increasing quality progress monitoring; supporting the development of student ownership and accountability; and retaining students.

Special Education Exhibit

UCA has included the following in this **Required Exhibit**:

- RDA scoring letters and EPR letters.
  - UCA has attached our APR Determination Letters and RDA designations from 2017, 2016, and 2015.
- Executive summaries from UPIPS review for the past three years, if applicable.
  - Per direction from the state office, UCA has included the past three years of program improvement (2016-17, 2015-16, and 2014-15), as the Executive Summary process is no longer in use.

If any other exhibits are needed, UCA will be happy to provide.

February 17, 2017

Dear Ms. Pearl-Weese,

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USBE-SES) has the authority and responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules (USBE SER). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities. The USBE-SES must provide an Annual Performance Report (APR) to describe the progress of each Local Education Agency (LEA) and the State toward meeting targets on performance indicators established by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The USBE-SES considers multiple sources of data including student enrollment, monitoring activities, professional development, stakeholder input, personnel qualifications, use of funding, and any other public information, to identify an APR determination score and the level of monitoring and support required for each LEA.

LEA determinations are made annually; therefore the determination about the status of each LEA and the criteria used will be reviewed and possibly modified each year by the USBE-SES. While each LEA is notified of its determination level, the USBE-SES is not required to inform the public, although public information requests must be honored. In making these determinations and in deciding on appropriate enforcement actions for the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 APR, the USBE-SES has considered all information available at the time of the determination, including the history, nature, and length of time of any reported noncompliance, and any evidence of correction. If the LEA provided data demonstrating correction of noncompliance in a timely manner within one year, the USBE-SES will consider the LEA to be in substantial compliance regarding that indicator. The APR compliance indicators used in making the determinations based upon FFY 2015 APR (2015–2016) data were:

-**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
-**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
-**Indicator 3:** Percent of youth with IEPs participating in and receiving a proficient score on Statewide assessments.
-**Indicator 4B*:** Percent of LEAs 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.

*Please note that beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, risk scores for Indicators 4A and 4B will be assigned based not only on LEA data but also on a statistical analysis of possible underreporting of LEA discipline data. LEAs are advised to conduct a review of LEA data practices and the accurate recording of discipline data for students with disabilities.

-**Indicator 6:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs in settings with typically developing peers.

-**Indicator 9:** Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

-**Indicator 10:** Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

-**Indicator 11:** Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and the evaluation completed within 45 school days.

-**Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who were found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

-**Indicator 13:** 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 age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those post-secondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs.

The USBE-SES has re-conceptualized its accountability system to more effectively support LEAs in delivering compliant special education programs which lead to positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Several stakeholders were involved in the revision process and provided input and feedback regarding this process. As a result, the USBE-SES provides differentiated levels of monitoring and support to LEAs based on need. While the USBE-SES monitoring and technical assistance efforts will continue to address compliance issues, efforts will focus on working collaboratively with LEAs to develop and strengthen their capacity to implement and scale-up effective instructional practices resulting in readiness for career, college, and independent living.

The USBE-SES has completed the annual data review for the 2015–2016 school year. As a result of the data review, Utah Connections Academy has been preliminarily placed in the USBE **Coaching Tier**, with an APR Determination of **Needs Intervention**. The data used in making this determination are enclosed. Risk Scores are given based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being low risk and 5 being high risk. For more information on the USBE tiers, supports and activities, please visit http://schools.utah.gov/sars/Laws/UPIPS.aspx. If you disagree with the data please contact Lindsey Adams within 30 days of receipt of this letter. APR Determinations and USBE Tier Assignments will become final in 30 days.

Utah Connections Academy must complete a Program Improvement Plan to address the areas of need and activities identified in the enclosed table, and any areas of need identified by the LEA. If Utah Connections Academy wishes the USBE-SES to review their Program Improvement Plan, it must be submitted for review by April 30, 2017. Final Program Improvement Plans must be submitted by June 30, 2017. If you have any additional questions, please call Lindsey Adams at (801) 538-7806.

Priority Area I: High Expectations and Beliefs						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 1: Graduation State Target: ≥ 69.59% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx Year End	5	30.00%	NO	39.59%	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify barriers to graduation for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one SMART-C goal within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA SMART-C goals must include activities to increase graduation rates for students with disabilities.
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 2: Dropout State Target: ≤ 37.90% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx Year End	4	60.00%	NO	22.10%	The LEA is 16% to 25% above the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify root causes of dropout for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one SMART-C goal within the Program Improvement Plan.
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement State Target: ≥ 79.52% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: Parent Survey	1	94.44%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.

Priority Area I: High Expectations and Beliefs cont'd						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 14: Post Secondary Outcomes						
State Target: 14A ≥ 26.00% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: Indicator 14 Survey	1	50.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
State Target: 14B ≥ 72.67% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: Indicator 14 Survey	1	100.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
State Target: 14C ≥ 87.83% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: Indicator 14 Survey	1	100.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Data	2016 Risk Score	Comments				Activities
Improvement Plan Focus on Student Outcomes	1	The LEA Improvement Plan includes a focus on student results based on desired outcomes identified in the LEA data analysis.				No required activities.

Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 3: Numeracy Grades 3-8 State Target: $\geq$ 17.60% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	2	16.67%	NO	0.93%	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	No required activities.
Indicator 3: Numeracy Grade 10 State Target: $\geq$ 7.08% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	1	50.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grades 3-8 State Target: $\geq$ 15.48% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	5	4.35%	NO	11.13%	The LEA is more than 10% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment on access to the general curriculum, teacher qualification, and effective instructional strategies. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one SMART-C goal within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA SMART-C goals must include procedures to implement formative assessment in English language arts for students with disabilities.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grade 10 State Target: $\geq$ 8.50% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	5	0.00%	NO	8.50%	The LEA is more than 6% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment on access to the general curriculum, teacher qualification, and effective instructional strategies. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one SMART-C goal within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA SMART-C goals must include procedures to implement formative assessment in English language arts for students with disabilities.

Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction cont'd						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.92% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2015–2016.	No required activities.
Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 51.60% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2015–2016.	No required activities.
Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.36% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2015–2016.	No required activities.
Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 45.19% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2015–2016.	No required activities.

Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction cont'd						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 91.10% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2015–2016.	No required activities.
Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 63.37% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2015–2016.	No required activities.

Priority Area III: Multi-Tiered System of Supports						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 4: Suspension and Expulsion						
Suspension and Expulsion of Student with IEPs State Target 4A: 0.00% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets the State target.	No required activities. USBE recommends a review of LEA data practices and the accurate recording of discipline data for students with disabilities.
Suspension and Expulsion of Students with IEPs Based on Race/Ethnicity State Target 4B: 0.00% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	NA	The LEA has no suspensions of students with disabilities for 10 days or more.	No required activities. USBE recommends a review of LEA data practices and the accurate recording of discipline data for students with disabilities.

Priority Area III: Multi-Tiered System of Supports cont'd						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 5: Access to the General Curriculum						
Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day State Target A: > 57.66% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	89.74%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage _Above_ Target	Comments	Activities
Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day State Target B: < 13.43% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	10.26%	YES	0.00%	The LEA is at or below the State target.	No required activities.
In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements State Target C: < 3.00% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA is at or below the State target.	No required activities.

Priority Area III: Multi-Tiered System of Supports cont'd						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 6: Preschool Settings						
Students Receiving Special Education in Regular Program State Target: ≥ 33.42% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	50.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage _Above_ Target	Comments	Activities
Students Receiving Special Education in Special Class or School State Target: ≤ 43.36% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.

General Supervision						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage _Above_ Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 9: Disproportionality State Target: 0.00% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	There is no disproportionality suspected within the LEA.	No required activities.
Indicator 10: Disproportionality State Target: 0.00% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	There is no disproportionality suspected within the LEA.	No required activities.
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Comments			Activities
Prevalence of Students with Disabilities within the LEA Data Year: 2016-2017 Data Source: Dec 1 2016 Child Count	3	13.24%	The LEA's prevalence rate of students with disabilities is between 13.00% and 15.99%.			LEA must conduct a self-assessment to determine if students are being misidentified as students with disabilities.

General Supervision cont'd						
Data	2016 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 11: **Child Find/Initial Evaluation** State Target: 100% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPIPS	1	100.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Indicator 12: **C to B Transition** State Target: 100% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: TEDI	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not have any students who transitioned from Part C to Part B in 2015–2016.	No required activities.
Indicator 13: **Secondary Transition Plans** State Target: 100% Data Year: 2015-2016 Data Source: UPIPS	5	50.00%	NO	50.00%	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify strengths and needs in the design of effective and compliant transition plans for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one SMART-C goal within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA SMART-C goals must include the design of effective and compliant transition plans for students with disabilities.

General Supervision cont'd			
Data	2016 Risk Score	Comments	Activities
Determination History	3	The LEA is in meets requirements for 2 of the prior 4 years.	LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify which APR indicators are or have been problematic for the LEA.
Quality of PIP	1	The LEA has submitted a Program Improvement Plan which addresses the areas of USBE identified need as well as areas of LEA selected focus.	No required activities.
Progress on PIP	1	The LEA provided evidence of progress toward achievement of all goals identified in the PIP.	No required activities.
Findings of Noncompliance	3	The LEA had some findings of noncompliance in the prior school year. Compliance rates are 61% to 89% for reviewed areas.	1. LEA must correct findings of noncompliance within one year of identification. 2. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify a root cause for the noncompliance.
Internal Monitoring	2	The LEA used the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USBE-approved LEA system) to review 75% or more of a representative sample of IEP files in 2015-2016.	LEA must ensure a representative sample of files is reviewed annually.
Dispute Resolution	1	The LEA has no complaints or due process proceedings with findings.	No required activities.
Fiscal	1	The LEA had 0 areas of moderate/high concern as identified in the FiCAM Risk Rubric.	No required activities.
Data Timeliness	1	All USBE required reports were submitted on or before the deadline.	No required activities.

April 26, 2015

Mr. Jeff Herr, Principal
Utah Connections Academy
687 West 700 South, Suite E
Woods Cross, UT   84087

Dear Mr. Herr,

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-SES) has the authority and responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Utah State Office of Education Special Education Rules (USOE SER). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities. The USOE-SES must provide an Annual Performance Report (APR) to describe the progress of each Local Education Agency (LEA) and the State toward meeting targets on performance indicators established by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The USOE-SES considers multiple sources of data including student enrollment, monitoring activities, professional development, stakeholder input, personnel qualifications, use of funding, and any other public information, to identify an APR determination score and the level of monitoring and support required for each LEA. LEA determinations are made annually; therefore the determination about the status of each LEA and the criteria used will be reviewed and possibly modified each year by the USOE-SES. While each LEA is notified of their determination level, the USOE-SES is not required to inform the public, although public information requests must be honored. In making these determinations and in deciding on appropriate enforcement actions for the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014 APR, the USOE-SES has considered all information available at the time of the determination, including the history, nature, and length of time of any reported noncompliance, and any evidence of correction. If the LEA provided data demonstrating correction of noncompliance in a timely manner within one year, the USOE-SES will consider the LEA to be in substantial compliance regarding that indicator. The SPP compliance indicators used in making the determinations based upon FFY 2014 APR (2014–2015) data were:

-**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
-**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
-**Indicator 4B:** Percent of LEAs 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.
-**Indicator 9:** Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 1

-**Indicator 10:** Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

-**Indicator 11:** Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and the evaluation completed within 45 school days.

-**Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who were found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

-**Indicator 13:** 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 age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those post-secondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs.

Determinations for FFY 2014 (2014–2015) will also include results from Indicator 3: Statewide Assessments. Determinations for FFY 2015 (2015–2016) will also include results from Indicator 6: Preschool Environments. The UOSE-SES has re-conceptualized its accountability system to more effectively support LEAs in delivering compliant special education programs which lead to positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Several stakeholders were involved in the revision process and provided input and feedback regarding this process. As a result, the USOE-SES provides differentiated levels of monitoring and support to LEAs based on need. While the USOE-SES monitoring and technical assistance efforts will continue to address compliance issues, efforts will focus on working collaboratively with LEAs to develop and strengthen their capacity to implement and scale-up effective instructional practices resulting in readiness for career, college, and independent living.

The USOE-SES has completed the annual data review for the 2014–2015 school year. As a result of the data review, Utah Connections Academy has been placed in the USOE **Coaching Tier**, with an APR Determination of **Needs Assistance**. The data used in making this determination are enclosed. For more information on the USOE tiers, supports and activities, please visit http://schools.utah.gov/sars/Laws,-State-Rules-and-Policies/Compliance.aspx.

Utah Connections Academy must complete a Program Improvement Plan to address the areas of need and activities identified in the enclosed table, and any areas of need identified by Utah Connections Academy. The Program Improvement Plan must be submitted for review by June 30, 2016.

If you have any additional questions, please call Lindsey Adams at (801) 538-7806.
cc: Ms. Susan Pearl-Weese Special Education Director

Priority Area I: High Expectations and Beliefs						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 1: Graduation State Target: ≥ 66.32% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: UTREx Year End	5	25.00%	NO	41.32%	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify barriers to graduation for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA Action Steps must include activities to increase graduation rates for students with disabilities.
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage _Above_ Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 2: Dropout State Target: ≤ 39.90% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: UTREx Year End	5	83.33%	NO	43.43%	The LEA is more than 25% above the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify root causes of dropout for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA Action Steps must include activities to retain students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out.
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement State Target: ≥ 86.14% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: Parent Survey	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not participate in the Parent Survey during the 2014-2015 school year.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 3

Priority Area I: High Expectations and Beliefs cont'd						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 14: Post Secondary Outcomes						
State Target: 14A > 25.25% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: Indicator 14 Survey	5	0.00%	NO	25.25%	The LEA is more than 21% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify barriers to higher education enrollment for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA Action Steps must include activities to improve enrollment in higher education.
State Target: 14B > 70.67% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: Indicator 14 Survey	5	0.00%	NO	70.67%	The LEA is more than 21% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify barriers to competitive employment for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA Action Steps must include activities to increase rates of competitive employment.
State Target: 14C > 84.83% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: Indicator 14 Survey	5	0.00%	NO	84.83%	The LEA is more than 31% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment to identify barriers to higher education, other postsecondary education or training, and competitive or other employment for students with disabilities. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA Action Steps must include activities to increase rates of post-secondary engagement.
Data	2015 Risk Score	Comments				Activities
Improvement Plan Focus on Student Outcomes	1	The LEA Improvement Plan includes a focus on student results based on desired outcomes identified in the LEA data analysis.				No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 4

Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 3: Numeracy Grades 3-8 State Target: $\geq$ 28.10% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	3	15.63%	NO	12.47%	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target and has increased the percent proficient by more than 5% over 2013-2014.	LEA must conduct a self-assessment related to access to the general curriculum and effective instructional strategies.
Indicator 3: Numeracy Grade 10 State Target: $\geq$ 17.07% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	1	22.22%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 5

				Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction cont'd		
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 3: Literacy Grades 3-8 State Target: > 25.64% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	5	9.09%	NO	16.55%	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment on access to general curriculum, teacher qualification, and effective instructional strategies. 2. LEA must apply results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan. 3. LEA Action Steps must include procedures to implement formative assessment in English language arts for students with disabilities.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grade 10 State Target: > 21.75% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: SAGE, DLM, and UAA results	4	7.14%	NO	14.61%	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	1. LEA must conduct a self-assessment related to access to the general curriculum and effective instructional strategies. 2. LEA must apply the results of the self-assessment to the development of at least one action step within the Program Improvement Plan.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 6

Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction cont'd						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.72% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2014-2015.	No required activities.
Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 51.40% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2014-2015.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 7

Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction cont'd						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.16% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2014-2015.	No required activities.
Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 44.99% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2014-2015.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 8

					Priority Area II: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction cont'd	
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.90% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2014-2015.	No required activities.
Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 63.17% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPOD	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll Preschool students in 2014-2015.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 9

Priority Area III: Multi-Tiered System of Supports						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 4: Suspension and Expulsion						
Suspension and Expulsion of Student with IEPs State Target 4A: 0.00% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA is at or below the State target.	No required activities.
Suspension and Expulsion of Students with IEPs Based on Race/Ethnicity State Target 4B: 0.00% Data Year: 2013-2014 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	NA	The LEA has no suspensions of students with disabilities for 10 days or more.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 10

Priority Area III: Multi-Tiered System of Supports cont'd						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 5: Access to the General Curriculum						
Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day State Target A: ≥ 57.23% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	90.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day State Target B: ≤ 13.50% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	10.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA is at or below the State target.	No required activities.
In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements State Target C: ≤ 3.00% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA is at or below the State target.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 11

Priority Area III: Multi-Tiered System of Supports cont'd						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 6: Preschool Settings						
Students Receiving Special Education in Regular Program State Target: $\geq$ 33.22% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	100.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Students Receiving Special Education in Special Class or School State Target: $\leq$ 43.56% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx December Child Count	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 12

General Supervision						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 9: Disproportionality State Target: 0.00% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	There is no disproportionality suspected within the LEA.	No required activities.
Indicator 10: Disproportionality State Target: 0.00% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UTREx Year End	1	0.00%	YES	0.00%	There is no disproportionality suspected within the LEA.	No required activities.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 13

General Supervision cont'd						
Data	2015 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 11: **Child Find/Initial Evaluation** State Target: 100% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPIPS	1	100.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	No required activities.
Indicator 12: **C to B Transition** State Target: 100% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: TEDI	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not have any students who transitioned from Part C to Part B in 2014-2015.	No required activities.
Indicator 13: **Secondary Transition Plans** State Target: 100% Data Year: 2014-2015 Data Source: UPIPS	1	100.00%	YES	0.00%	The LEA meets the State target.	No required activities. Professional development on the design of effective and compliant transition plans is recommended.

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 14

General Supervision cont'd			
Data	**2015 Risk Score**	**Comments**	**Activities**
Determination History	2	The LEA is in Meets Requirements for 4 of the prior 5 years.	No required activities.
Quality of PIP	NA	This data point will be scored for Program Improvement Plans submitted in 2016.	No required activities.
Progress on PIP	This area was not used in making tiered monitoring assignments for the 2014-2015 school year. It will be included in assignments for the 2015-2016 school year.		
Findings of Noncompliance	1	The LEA had no findings of noncompliance in 2014-2015.	No required activities.
Internal Monitoring	1	The LEA is using the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USOE-approved LEA system) to review a representative sample of IEP files annually.	No required activities.
Dispute Resolution	1	The LEA has no complaints or due process proceedings with findings.	No required activities.
Fiscal	1	The LEA has low fiscal risk, as identified by the 2013-2014 single audit or financial statement audit.	No required activities.
Data Timeliness	1	All USOE required reports were submitted on or before the deadline.	No required activities.
Prevalence of Students with Disabilities within the LEA	No Risk Score assigned for FFY 2014	13.92	NA

250 East 500 South   P.O. Box 144200   Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200   Voice: (801) 538-7500   Fax: (801) 538-7769
Sydnee Dickson, Interim State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Page 15

February 25, 2015

Ms. Linda Harless, Principal
Utah Connections Academy
687 West 700 South, Suite E
Woods Cross, UT   84087

Dear Ms. Harless,

The Utah State Office of Education, Special Education Services (USOE-SES) has the authority and responsibility of monitoring compliance with federal and state requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules (USBE SER). This responsibility is administered within the framework of supporting positive results for students with disabilities. The USOE-SES must provide an Annual Performance Report (APR) to describe the progress of each Local Education Agency (LEA) and the State toward meeting targets on performance indicators established by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The USOE-SES considers multiple sources of data including student enrollment, monitoring activities, professional development, stakeholder input, personnel qualifications, use of funding, and any other public information, to identify an APR determination score and the level of monitoring and support required for each LEA.

LEA determinations are made annually; therefore the determination about the status of each LEA and the criteria used will be reviewed and possibly modified each year by the USOE-SES. While each LEA is notified of their determination level, the USOE-SES is not required to inform the public, although public information requests must be honored. In making these determinations and in deciding on appropriate enforcement actions for the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013 APR, the USOE-SES has considered all information available at the time of the determination, including the history, nature, and length of time of any reported noncompliance, and any evidence of correction. If the LEA provided data demonstrating correction of noncompliance in a timely manner within one year, the USOE-SES will consider the LEA to be in substantial compliance regarding that indicator. The APR compliance indicators used in making the determinations based upon FFY 2013 APR (2013–2014) data were:

 -**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
 -**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
 -**Indicator 4B:** Percent of LEAs 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.
 -**Indicator 9:** Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
 -**Indicator 10:** Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate

identification.

- **Indicator 11:** Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and the evaluation completed within 45 school days.
- **Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who were found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- **Indicator 13:** 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 age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those post-secondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs.

Determinations for FFY 2014 (2014–2015) will also include results from Indicator 3: Statewide Assessments. Determinations for FFY 2015 (2015–2016) will also include results from Indicator 6: Preschool Environments.

The USOE-SES has re-conceptualized its accountability system to more effectively support LEAs in delivering compliant special education programs which lead to positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Several stakeholders were involved in the revision process and provided input and feedback regarding this process. As a result, the USOE-SES provides differentiated levels of monitoring and support to LEAs based on need. While the USOE-SES monitoring and technical assistance efforts will continue to address compliance issues, efforts will focus on working collaboratively with LEAs to develop and strengthen their capacity to implement and scale-up effective instructional practices resulting in readiness for career, college, and independent living.

The USOE-SES has completed the annual data review for the 2013–2014 school year. As a result of the data review, Utah Connections Academy has been preliminarily placed in the USOE **Coaching Tier**, with an APR Determination of **Needs Assistance**. The data used in making this determination are enclosed. Risk Scores are given based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being low risk and 5 being high risk. For more information on the USOE tiers, supports and activities, please visit http://schools.utah.gov/sars/Laws,-State-Rules-and-Policies/Compliance.aspx. If you disagree with the data please contact Tiffanie Owens within 30 days of receipt of this letter. APR Determinations and USOE Tier Assignments will become final in 30 days.

Utah Connections Academy must complete a Program Improvement Plan to address the areas of need and activities identified in the enclosed table, and any areas of need identified by Utah Connections Academy. The Program Improvement Plan must be submitted for review by May 30, 2015.

If you have any additional questions, please call Tiffanie Owens at (801) 538-7806.

cc: Ms. Susan Pearl-Weese, Special Education Director

Priority Area I: Effective Instruction in Literacy and Numeracy						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 3: Numeracy Grades 3-8 State Target: > 19.52%	4	0.00%	No	19.52%	LEA is 16% to 25% below the state target of 19.52%.	Self-Assessment and Improvement Plan must include access to general curriculum, educator qualification, and effective instructional strategies.
Indicator 3: Numeracy Grade 10 State Target: > 22.10%	4	0.00%	n<10	22.01%	LEA is 16% to 25% below the state target of 22.01%	Self-Assessment and Improvement Plan must include access to the general curriculum, educator qualification, and effective instructional strategies.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grades 3-8 State Target: > 16.70%	3	4.55%	No	12.15%	LEA is 6% to 15% below the state target of 16.70%.	Self-Assessment and Improvement Plan must consider access to general curriculum and effective instructional strategies.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grade 10 State Target: > 12.82%	4	0.00%	No	12.82%	LEA had 0% proficiency of students with disabilities on the ELA 10 assessment.	Self-Assessment and Improvement Plan must include access to general curriculum, educator qualifications, and effective instructional strategies.

Priority Area II: Preschool						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 12: C to B Transition State Target: 100.00%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage _Below_ Target A _Above_ Target B	Comments	Activities
Indicator 6: Preschool Settings						
Percent of Students Receiving Special Education in Regular Program State Target A: ≥ 33.02%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll any students with disabilities age 3-5 in 2013-2014.	NA
Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education in Special Class or School State Target B: ≤ 43.76%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA did not enroll any students with disabilities age 3-5 in 2013-2014.	NA

		Priority Area II: Preschool cont'd				
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.52%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA does not provide a preschool program and therefore is not required to report Utah Preschool Outcomes Data.	NA
Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 51.20%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA does not provide a preschool program and therefore is not required to report Utah Preschool Outcomes Data.	NA
Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 89.96%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA does not provide a preschool program and therefore is not required to report Utah Preschool Outcomes Data.	NA

Priority Area II: Preschool cont'd						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes						
Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 44.79%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA does not provide a preschool program and therefore is not required to report Utah Preschool Outcomes Data.	NA
Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 1: State Target: ≥ 90.70%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA does not provide a preschool program and therefore is not required to report Utah Preschool Outcomes Data.	NA
Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 2: State Target: ≥ 62.97%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The LEA does not provide a preschool program and therefore is not required to report Utah Preschool Outcomes Data.	NA

Priority Area III: School to Post School						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 1: Graduation State Target: ≥ 62.13%	5	0.00%	No	62.13%	The LEA is 26% or more below the State target of 62.13%.	As part of the Self-Assessment process, conduct a data review to identify students who require more intensive supports in order to graduate with the 4-year cohort. Address self-assessment findings in the LEA Improvement Plan.
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 2: Dropout State Target: ≤ 6.89%	3	22.22%	No	15.33%	The LEA is 6% to 15% above the State target of 6.89%.	Conduct a review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices related to data collection and reporting in the area of drop out.
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Plans State Target: 100%	1	100.00%	Yes	NA	NA	NA

Priority Area III: School to Post School cont'd						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 14: Post Secondary Outcomes						
Enrolled in Higher Education State Target 14A: ≥ 24.50%	4	0.00%	No	24.50%	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target of 24.5%. 0% response rate; 0% not engaged.	Review and revise LEA policies, procedures, and practices in the area of transition to ensure access to higher education is considered as part of the transition plan. The LEA Improvement Plan must address strategies to increase the number of students accessing higher education. Review LEA policies, procedures, and practices to identify potential reasons for the low response rate. Include strategies to improve the response rate in the LEA Improvement Plan.
Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed State Target 14B: ≥ 67.67%	5	0.00%	No	67.67%	The LEA is 26% or more below the State target of 67.67% of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education or competitively employed one year after exiting. 0% response rate; 0% not engaged.	Review and revise LEA policies, procedures, and practices in the area of transition to ensure access to higher education and competitive employment are considered as part of the transition plan. The LEA Improvement Plan must address strategies to increase the number of students accessing higher education and competitive employment. Identify professional development needs in the area of transition planning. Review LEA policies, procedures, and practices to identify potential reasons for the low response rate. Include strategies to improve the response rate in the LEA Improvement Plan.

Priority Area III: School to Post School cont'd						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 14: Post Secondary Outcomes						
Enrolled in Higher Education, or in Some Other Postsecondary Education or Training Program, or Competitively Employed State Target 14C: ≥ 81.83%	5	0.00%	No	81.83%	The LEA is 26% or more below the State target of 81.83% of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education or posstsecondary training, or competitively or non-competitively employed one year after exiting. response rate; 0% not engaged.	Review and revise LEA policies, procedures, and practices in the area of transition to ensure access to postsecondary training, higher education, competitive employment, and non-competitive employment are considered as part of the transition plan. The LEA Improvement Plan must address strategies to increase the number of students engaged in training or employment after exiting. Identify professional development needs in the area of transition planning. Review LEA policies, procedures, and practices to identify potential reasons for the low response rate. Include strategies to improve the response rate in the LEA Improvement Plan.

Priority Area IV: General Supervision						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target A _Above_ Target B	Comments	Activities
Indicator 5: Access to General Curriculum						
Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day State Target 5A: > 56.81%	1	93.24%	Yes	NA	The LEA provides a continuum of placement options to support student access to age appropriate peers and the Utah Core Standards and Essential Elements. Indicator 5A results are at or above the State target of 56.81%.	NA
Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day State Target 5B: < 13.57%	1	4.05%	Yes	NA	The LEA provides a continuum of placement options to support student access to age appropriate peers and the Utah Core Standards and Essential Elements. Indicator 5B results are at or below the State target of 13.57%.	NA

Priority Area IV: General Supervision						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target C	Comments	Activities
Indicator 5: Access to General Curriculum						
In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements State Target 5C: < 3.00%	1	0.00%	Yes	NA	The LEA provides a continuum of placement options to support student access to age appropriate peers and the Utah Core Standards and Essential Elements. Indicator 5C results are at or below the State target of 3%.	NA

Priority Area IV: General Supervision cont'd						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 4B: Suspension and Expulsion State Target: 0.00%	1	0.00%	Yes	NA	The LEA does not have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension or expulsion of students with disabilities.	NA
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement State Target: ≥ 86.04%	1	90.48%	Yes	NA	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target of 86.04%.	NA

Priority Area IV: General Supervision cont'd						
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage *Above* Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 9: Disproportionality State Target: 0.00%	NA	NA	NA	NA	LEA does not have any subgroups that meet the minimum "n" size required to calculate a risk ratio.	NA
Indicator 10: Disproportionality State Target: 0.00%	NA	NA	NA	NA	LEA does not have any subgroups that meet the minimum "n" size required to calculate a risk ratio.	NA
Data	2014 Risk Score	LEA Data	Meets Target?	Percentage Below Target	Comments	Activities
Indicator 11: Child Find/Initial Evaluation State Target: 100%	1	100.00%	Yes	NA	NA	NA

Priority Area IV: General Supervision cont'd			
Data	2014 Risk Score	Comments	Activities
Determination History	1	NA	NA
Improvement Plan Focus on Student Outcomes	1	NA	NA
Quality of PIP	This area was not used in making tiered monitoring assignments for the 2014-2015 school year. It will be included in assignments for the 2015-2016 school year.		
Progress on PIP	This area was not used in making tiered monitoring assignments for the 2014-2015 school year. It will be included in assignments for the 2016-2017 school year.		
Findings of Noncompliance	2	21 findings; 98% compliance rate.	Correct findings of noncompliance.
Internal Monitoring	1	NA	NA
Dispute Resolution	1	NA	NA
Fiscal	2	NA	NA
Data Timeliness	1	NA	NA
SEA Concerns	3	Concerns from multiple departments reported: Charter Schools and Special Education.	Policy, procedure, and practice review.

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY General Supervision Program Improvement Plan (2016-2017)

General Supervision Data Sources

- ☑ APR Indicators, 3, 11
- ☑ Stakeholder input
- ☑ Previous UPIPS Results
- ☐ Interview Responses
- ☐ Off-site data
- ☐ Teacher licenses, endorsements and highly qualified status for current assignments
- ☐ Caseloads of special education case manages
- ☐ Policies and procedures in place and followed LEA-wide
- ☑ Student progress data
- ☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Leadership/Administration				
• Improvement Plan Focus on Student Outcomes	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Quality of Program Improvement Plan	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Progress on Program Improvement Plan	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Qualified Staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Professional Development	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Policies & Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge & Effective Instruction				
• Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials				
• NIMAC/NIMAS	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in Secondary Settings				
• Suspension and Expulsion - Indicator 4	☑	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• Finance				
• Fiscal Audit	☑	☐	☐	☐
• FiCAM	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Data				
• State and Federal Reports	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Data Timeliness	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Compliance and Legal Issues				
• Child Find	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Initial Evaluation Timelines - Indicator 11	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Reevaluation Timelines	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Part C to Part B Transition Timelines - Indicator 12	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Referral Process	☐	☐	☐	☐
• LEA Internal Monitoring Procedure	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Evaluation Materials	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Confidentiality	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Dispute Resolution	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Evaluation/Eligibility Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
• English Proficiency Assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Forms	☐	☐	☐	☐
• IEE Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Findings of Noncompliance	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Annual Performance Reports				
• Determination Level	☐	☑	☐	☐

- Determination History ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐

Data Analysis: General Supervision Strengths

A stakeholder group (steering committee) was involved in analyzing data and making recommendations for this year's Program Improvmeent Plan (PIP). The stakeholder group consisted of the following: parent of student with disabilities; special education teacher; general education teacher; special education director.

UCA has an ongoing LEA internal monitoring procedure in place using the UPIPS online program. UCA monitors a minimum of 20 files per year for compliance.

UCA has a focus on student outcomes. This year's PIP includes four goals that support student outcomes.

According to the 2017 RDA letter, UCA received a risk score of 1 in the following areas: quality of improvement plan, Indicator 4-suspension and expulsion, fiscal reports (0 areas of moderate to high concern), state and federal reports (100% submitted), data timeliness (100% of reports submitted on time), Indicator 11-initial evaluation timelines (100% compliance), and dispute resolution (0 complaints/duer process proceedings).

According to the LEA Internal Review, the following areas of strength were noted (100% compliance): Indicator 11-timely evaluation, re-evaluation-review of existing data, current eligibility-initial evaluation.

Data Analysis: General Supervision Needs

The 2017 RDA letter designated a risk score of 3 for UCA's prevalence of students with disabilities. UCA conducted a self-assessment to determine whether or not students were being misidentified as having a disability. The findings of the self-assessment were:Tiered instruction is in place and being utilized. Student support team meets weekly. a teacher-leader is responsible for monitoring and tracking RTI process. Due to virtual environment, the school has higher than average rate of enrollment for students with disabilities. The virtual environment is conducive to parents interested in homeschooling. Although UCA will continue to monitor prevalence, at this time it is not a concern that would warrant a goal.

The LEA Internal Review determined that re-evaluation timelines are a need (58.8% compliance rate). A root cause analysis revealed that due to the number of files coming in from other schools and a number of students entering from home schools, the re-evaluation timelines are not always caught and corrected to greatest extent possible students enter. A compliance goal targeting this issue has been included in this PIP (Goal 2: Compliance Monitoring).

According to the 2017 RDA letter, UCA received a risk score of 3 in findings of noncompliance. 100% of items of noncompliance were corrected within one year. A root cause analysis determined that onboarding of new teachers did not contain extensive training on new policies regarding transition planning.

According to the 2017 RDA letter, UCA received a risk score of 3 in determination history. A self-assessment was conducted to identify which APR indicators are or have been problematic. The self-assessment showed that Indicators 1, 2 and 3 have been problematic. Probable root causes are included in the appropriate program areas for each of these indicators. Goals have been included in this PIP that support all three areas.

Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 3

File Compliance Monitoring

Resource Category: Findings of Noncompliance,

SMART-C Goal: Given LEA self-assessment, UCA will increase file compliance to 100% for all areas of review for Special Education files within one school year.

Progress Monitoring Plan: -- Increase number and frequency of internal file reviews on incoming and existing files. -- Review and emphasize case-manager "ownership" of student files. -- Train and re-train staff on awareness of potential compliancy issues and methods of correction, if appropriate. -- Train clerical staff on increased efficiency of obtaining complete files and documents.

Action Steps: -- Professional development and specific training of new and existing staff to review incoming files for problematic and missing file entries and documents. -- Train Special Education staff and clerical staff to highlight and early warn of problematic files and issues of date-compliancy. -- Increase number and frequency of internal file reviews and correct what can be corrected (on incoming files) during the school year.

General Supervision LEA Person Responsible

General Supervision Dates for Review

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility	11/01/2017
				04/01/2018
John Gutman	801-298-6660	jgutman@uca.connectionsacademy.org	Goal 3	

General Supervision Communication Log

General Supervision Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
3/28/2017 8:39:44 PM	16-17 UCA Formative Assessments.xlsx
3/28/2017 8:40:15 PM	16-17 UCA Teacher Survey Accommodations.csv

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY FAPE in the LRE Program Improvement Plan (2016-2017)

FAPE in the LRE Data Sources

☑ APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6
☑ Previous UPIPS Results
☑ Interview Responses
☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Individualized Education Program				
• Accommodations	☐	☐	☐	☐
• IEP and Placement	☑	☐	☐	☐
• PLAAFP & Goals	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Service Delivery	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Extended School Year	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Health Care Plan	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Related Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
• IEP Team Membership	☑	☐	☐	☐
• EL Evaluations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge & Effective Instruction				
• Numeracy - Indicator 3	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Literacy - Indicator 3	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Preschool Outcomes - Indicator 7	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Accessible Instructional Technology & Materials	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Access to the General Curriculum - Indicator 5	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Preschool Settings - Indicator 6	☐	☐	☐	☐
• LRE and Placement	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Paraprofessionals				
• Training and Supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in Secondary Settings				
• Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports Available in All Settings	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Behavior/Discipline Procedures	☑	☐	☐	☐
• EL Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• IEP Timelines	☐	☑	☐	☐

Data Analysis: FAPE in the LRE Strengths

The stakeholder sub-committee; gen ed teacher and principal, reviewed the data of APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, previous UPIPS results, and discussed findings. They have identified areas of strengths that include: Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials, Access to the General Curriculum as well as LRE in Placement decisions, and IEP compliance in the areas of Related Services and IEP Team Membership.

The stakeholder committee found that in order to provide Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials, Utah Connections Academy utilizes Bookshare, NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking, Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. Curriculum can be modified specifically to each student's needs and is available through the educational management system to all team members. Instruction is provided through LiveLesson classroom from the Gen Ed teachers as well as the Special Education teachers. Small group and one-on-one instruction is available through the same means. Students have access to all other means of communication through the educational management system via Message Boards, webmails, and phone calls with teachers. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students. Utah Connections Academy also utilizes Bookshare in order to provide accessible materials in NIMAC/NIMAS formats. Connections Academy has completed Professional Development for accessibility training in order to format presentations and curriculum that is aligned with NIMAC/ NIMAS standards. UCA has utilized additional programs that include: NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking as well as Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students.

Individual Education Programs- Based on the data from the internal monitoring compliance report, UCA has demonstrated strengths in the areas of Current IEP evident in file (100%), Current Eligibility evident in file (100%), Service Delivery (100%), Related Services (100%), Extended School Year (100%), Team Membership for all areas (100%) and Placement (100%) .

Access to the General Curriculum-According to state reports, 89.74% of enrolled students particpate in the General Curriculum. Only 10.26% of enrolled students spend more than 60% of their educational time with Special Education Teachers and specialized curriculum. UCA received a risk score of "1" in the 2016-17 RDA letter for Indicator 5: Access to the General Curriculum. UCA met the state target in all three areas of Indicator 5. This is an identified strength for UCA.

Retaining Students numbers - According to enrollment records, UCA retained enrollment of 36.87% of Special Education students enrolled at the end of the 14-15 SY with 9% of total student population graduating. Historically, UCA has retained Special Education students with 40.26% at the end of the 12-13 SY, 40.37% at the end of the 13-14 SY with 22.08% of additional students returning from the 12-13 SY. According to the Intent to Return (ITR) survey, the current (16-17 SY) ITR data suggests that 59.6% of students will be returning next year, 8.4% will be graduating, only 11% not returning and 21% still undecided. UCA will continue to monitor trend and determine needs, if applicable, in the future.

Overall, the goal of 80% for implementation and consistency of accommodations was met. However, with the continuing expansion of the school enrollment and additional teachers, the need for ongoing professional development is evident. 94% of all teachers attended professional development for accommodations in the virtual environment. Over 83.33% of the teachers utilize communication tools for collaboration with sped teachers and the tools to deliver accommodations in the virtual setting. UCA has incorporated accommodations professional development for all new and returning teachers. UCA will continue to monitor delivery of accommodations for students with disabilities. This is an identified strength for UCA. This goal has been discontinued.

UPDN provided professional development target toward math instruction for all math teachers K-12 and special education. They focused on providing concrete representation in the virtual setting. Overall math proficiency scores has increased and APR indicator 3 had a risk score of 2 for Numeracy Grades 3-8, a risk score of 1 for Numeracy Grade 10. The area of Math proficiency is identified as a strength.

UCA, in coordination with Connections Education, has implemented a Tiered Level System of Support for all students that includes RTI procedures. This support includes a Student Support Team that meets weekly to discuss student needs and possible identification/referral of students with disabilities.

Data Analysis: FAPE in the LRE Needs

At the conclusion of the 15-16 school year, students participated in the SAGE Assessment. Overall composite scores show the following proficiency rates in ELA 2.3% and Math 13.9%. This demonstrated a decrease in ELA and an increase in Math. SAGE assessment scores for ELA range from 0%-16.7%. These ELA scores are below State average for SWD statewide in 8 of the 9 grades. The 2016-17 RDA letter indicated a risk score of 5 for Literacy: Grades 3-8 (4.35%) and a risk score of 5 for Literacy: Grade 10 (0%). SAGE assessment scores for Math range from 0%-100% and are At or Above State average for SWD statewide in 5 of the 9 grades. However, these scores as still below the average state proficiency for all students and identified as an area of concern. According to review by stakeholder committee, APR indicators demonstrated proficiency for students in the area of Math with a risk score of 1. Performance increased from 0% to 13.9% in Numeracy in Grades 3-8 (Risk score of 2) and 0% to 22.22% in Numeracy in Grade 10 (Risk score of 1). The stakeholder committee and State Mentor identified possible root causes for current proficiency levels to be the need for data analysis in supplemental instruction programs for ELA, and the need to increase differentiated instruction in tier one across all subjects.

The stakeholder committee analyzed the data from internal reviews and determined that IEP timeline compliance has increased from 71% to 89% in the 15-16 SY. The internal LEA review indicated that IEP timeline compliance was 80% with more than 15 files reviewed. Possible root cause is the incoming files that demonstrate differences in multiple district procedures for the processing of files and the high number of students returning to public school from home school placement. Although changes in the processing of incoming files has shown a significant increase the first year, this area will be included in General Supervision as a goal for File Compliance Monitoring in order to create a process for bringing incoming files into compliance.

Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 6

Student Summative Outcomes

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: UCA will increase summative performance scores in ELA and Math by 5% overall within one school year.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will monitor scores in ELA and Math in LEAP/Scantron pre- and mid test in order to analyze progress toward EOY summative assessments.

Action Steps: In order to increase the ELA proficiency, UCA will increase use of data analysis for the supplemental instruction programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction. In order to increase the Math proficiency, UCA will increase data analysis for the supplemental instruction programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction. The UPDN will provide professional development in the area of data analysis for all staff members.

FAPE in the LRE LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionsacademy.org	Goal 6

FAPE in the LRE Dates for Review

11/24/2017

03/30/2018

FAPE in the LRE Communication Log

FAPE in the LRE Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
3/28/2017 8:40:41 PM	16-17 UCA Teacher Survey Accommodations.csv
3/28/2017 8:40:56 PM	16-17 UCA Formative Assessments.xlsx

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Disproportionality Program Improvement Plan (2016-2017)

Disproportionality Data Sources

☑ APR Indicators 9, 10

☑ Child count data to review prevalence and categories of disabilities by race/ethnicity

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
• Disproportionate Representation - Indicator 9	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Disproportionate Representation by Disability Category - Indicator 10	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Disproportionality Strengths

UCA received a risk score of 1 for indicators 9 and 10 for the SY 16-17.

Data Analysis: Disproportionality Needs

No needs are identified at this time.

Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Disproportionality LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Disproportionality Dates for Review

Disproportionality Communication Log

Disproportionality Evidence Upload

Date	File Name

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Parent Involvement Program Improvement Plan (2016-2017)

Parent Involvement Data Sources

☑ APR Indicator 8
☑ Previous UPIPS Results
☑ Interview Responses
☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Communication				
• Parent Survey - Indicator 8	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Communication in a Variety of Languages	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Emergency Contact Procedures (LRBI)	☑	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• Procedural Safeguards				
• Copies to Parents	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Written Prior Notice	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Notice of Meeting	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Parental Consent	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Surrogate Parents	☐	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Parent Involvement Strengths

APR Indicator score is a 1 for school year 15-16 with LEA data of 94.44% for Indicator 8: Parent involvement.

The stakeholder committee analyzed the data from the internal and external (UCA 16-17, USOE 15-16) file reviews. They identified a number of areas of strengths. According to the LEA Internal Review, the following areas were at 100% compliance: parental consent for evaluation as well as 100% for Notice of IEP Meeting. The external (USOE 15-16) compliance summary indicates that the areas of parent consent for initial evaluation, notice of meeting for eligibility, parent input for determining eligibility and notice of IEP meeting provided to adult student all showed 100% compliance.

Communication in various languages- Utah Connections Academy utilizes forms available on the state website in various languages if needed. UCA also has the availability of translation programs through Google apps to translate in writing documents in a variety of languages. If needed, UCA has access, through Connections Education (parent corp), to translation services through professional firms.

Emergency Contact procedures (LRBI)- Utah Connections Academy utilizes the LRBI manual provided by the state for all behavioral issues that may present itself with current and future students. This document contains the Emergency Contact form as well as the guidelines.

Data Analysis: Parent Involvement Needs
No identified needs at this time.

Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Parent Involvement LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Parent Involvement Dates for Review

Parent Involvement Communication Log

Parent Involvement Evidence Upload

Date	File Name

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Transition Program Improvement Plan (2016-2017)

Transition Data Sources

- ☑ APR Indicators 7, 12, 13, 14
- ☑ Previous UPIPS Results
- ☐ Interview Responses
- ☐ TEDI data
- ☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Graduation - Indicator 1	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Dropout - Indicator 2	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Post Secondary Outcomes - Indicator 14	☑	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge & Effective Instruction				
• Secondary Transition Evidence-based Practices & Predictors of Post-school Success	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in Secondary Settings				
• Interagency Involvement and Collaboration	☐	☐	☐	☐
• School Programs to Encourage Parent Involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Academic Rigor for All Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
• A Network of Timely Supports	☐	☐	☐	☐
• A Culture of College Access	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Effective Use of Data	☐	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• School to Post School Transition				
◦ Complete Secondary Transition Plans - Indicator 13				
◦ Transition Plans by 16th Birthday	☑	☐	☐	☐
◦ Post Secondary Goals	☐	☑	☐	☐
◦ Age Appropriate Transition Assessments	☐	☑	☐	☐
◦ Transition Services	☐	☑	☐	☐
◦ Courses of Study	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Age of Majority	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Summary of Performance	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Notice to Adult Students	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Transition Strengths

While compiling data and reviewing areas, it was decided that the APR indicators 6, 7, and 12 apply to a preschool program. UCA does not have a preschool program currently.

In analyzing the data collected and discussion with the stakeholders committee, several areas of strength were identified in the area of School-to-Post -School Transition.

Transition plans-age 14: According to internal reviews, UCA has 100% compliance with completing a transition plan for students age 14 and older. Each file reviewed contained a transition plan. Summary of internal file compliance review follows: 100% of students/adult students were invited to the IEP team meeting, 100% of post-secondary goals were updated annually, 100% of files had Age-Appropriate assessments, 100% of students had an annual IEP goal related to transition needs, 100% of files had Transition services for Education/Instruction, 100% of files had Transition services for Career/Employment, 100% of files had Transition services for Community Experiences, 100% of files had Transition Services for Post-school Adult Living, and 100% of files contained Transition Courses of Study. As part of the external USBE 15-16 File Compliance Review, 100% of students had a transition plan included in the student's file, and 100% of students had a current transition plan.

Age of Majority Rights - According to the Internal and external reviews, UCA had 100% compliance with providing students and parents the information regarding the Age of Majority rights during the IEP meeting at least one year before the student's 18th birthday.

Notice to Students/ Adult Students - According to the internal compliance review, UCA demonstrated that 100% of students/adult students received the Notice of Meeting, attended the meeting and received all required documents.

According to the 2016 RDA report, UCA received a score of 1 in all 3 areas of indicator # 14 Post Secondary Outcomes (Enrollment/Employment). UCA had 100% of students respond to post graduation phone survey. Due to the small "n" size, UCA participated in the USOE survey by attending training and providing follow-up assistance for any phone calls not answered during the USOE survey. Goal has been completed for this area.

Data Analysis: Transition Needs

In analyzing the APR annual data, Previous UPIPS results and interview responses, the stakeholder committee has identified areas of need in order to increase the number of special education students that graduate.

APR indicator 13 was scored at 5 with 50% compliance. According to the external USBE File Compliance Review, 100% of files had a Transition Plan included in the student's file, 67% of files had Age-Appropriate assessments, 44% of files had Measurable Postsecondary Goals, 89% of students had an annual IEP goal related to transition needs, 89% of files had Transition services for Education/Instruction, 78% of files had Transition services for Career/Employment, 44% of files had Transition services for Community Experiences, 44% of files had Transition Services for Post-school Adult Living, and 89% of files contained Transition Courses of Study. These compliance issues were addressed within the annual time frame for corrections and were completed by May 23, 2016 (6 weeks after On Site Review). 50% corrections were completed within the 3 week window following the USBE File Compliance On Site Review. The possible root cause of this summary could be the onboarding training of new teachers and the status of incoming files to UCA. A compliance goal is included in this PIP.

Age Appropriate Transition Assessments - According to the USBE 15-16 on site visit, 67% of files reviewed contained age appropriate assessments. According to the internal LEA review for 16-17 SY, 100% of transition age students answered transition assessments prior to the IEP meeting. The possible root cause of this summary could be the onboarding training of new teachers and the status of incoming files to UCA.

The 2016-17 RDA letter indicated a risk score of 5: Graduation with 30% of students in the 14-15 data year. Initial graduation data for 15-16 data year indicates that graduation rate has increased to 50%. The remaining out of cohort seniors are continuing enrollment and still plan on graduating. At the end of 15-16 SY, 90% (9 of 10)of on-cohort seniors graduated on time. Graduation indicator includes number of out of cohort seniors that are still enrolled and seeking a diploma. The possible root cause of the graduation rate could be due to the availability of continuing enrollment past cohort date for seniors that are still engaged in receiving a diploma. This provision directly affects the graduation rate due to the small 'N' size of UCA population. A goal is continued in the PIP for this indicator.

According to the 2016 RDA letter, UCA has a risk score of 4 for Indicator 2: Dropouts and a drop out percentage of 60.00%. The initial data for 16-17 demonstrates a decrease in the dropout percentage to 38.10%. The stakeholder committee determined that the root cause is monitoring of miscoding errors while inputting data into state reporting system, and the need for continued monitoring of withdrawn students as to whether they have enrolled in other schools (tracking forward). "Out of cohort" seniors, who count as dropouts, has increased slightly and these students are continuing enrollment with plans of graduating. Utah Connections Academy has created a tracking system for student withdrawing from our school in order to track student progress forward by means of weekly DataView export spreadsheet. Although the LEA goal was met, the dropout rate does not yet meet the state target. Utah Connections Academy will continue to monitor student withdrawal and encouraging participation while increasing support for cohort graduation. Goal will be continued for next school year.

Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 6

Secondary Dropout Rate

Resource Category: Dropout - Indicator 2,

SMART-C Goal: Within one school year, UCA will decrease the dropout rate for students in grades 9-12 by 5% as measured by the end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Track process of all withdrawing students through internal DataViews, UtreX and student's home district.

Action Steps: UCA will implement a monitoring process for students that want to withdraw to insure and encourage participation in traditional or non-traditional settings for completing graduation requirements as measured by state reporting of dropout rates.

Goal 7

Secondary Graduation Rate

Resource Category: Graduation - Indicator 1,

SMART-C Goal: Within one school year, UCA will increase students graduating with cohort peers by 5% as measured by end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Grades and credits earned as listed on the Gradebook, transcript and IEP Special Requirements for Graduation page will be reviewed mid-term and end of term.

Action Steps: UCA will increase focus on graduation w/i cohort year by providing additional resources and opportunities for students to engage in transition planning and goal setting during transition classes in order to create a path to graduation as measured by graduation rates in the end of year data.

Transition LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionsacademy.org	Goal 7
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionsacademy.org	Goal 6

Transition Dates for Review

01/26/2018

06/01/2018

Transition Communication Log

Transition Evidence Upload

Date	File Name

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY General Supervision Program Improvement Plan (2015-2016)

General Supervision Data Sources

- ☑ APR Indicators, 3, 11
- ☐ Stakeholder input
- ☑ Previous UPIPS Results
- ☐ Interview Responses
- ☐ Off-site data
- ☑ Teacher licenses, endorsements and highly qualified status for current assignments
- ☐ Caseloads of special education case manages
- ☐ Policies and procedures in place and followed LEA-wide
- ☑ Student progress data
- ☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Leadership/Administration				
• Improvement Plan Focus on Student Outcomes	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Quality of Program Improvement Plan	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Progress on Program Improvement Plan	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Qualified Staff	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Professional Development	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Policies & Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge & Effective Instruction				
• Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials				
• NIMAC/NIMAS	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in Secondary Settings				
• Suspension and Expulsion - Indicator 4	☑	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• Finance				
• Fiscal Audit	☑	☐	☐	☐
• FiCAM	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Data				
• State and Federal Reports	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Data Timeliness	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Compliance and Legal Issues				
• Child Find	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Initial Evaluation Timelines - Indicator 11	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Reevaluation Timelines	☐	☑	☑	☐
• Part C to Part B Transition Timelines - Indicator 12	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Referral Process	☐	☐	☐	☐
• LEA Internal Monitoring Procedure	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Evaluation Materials	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Confidentiality	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Dispute Resolution	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Evaluation/Eligibility Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
• English Proficiency Assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Forms	☐	☐	☐	☐
• IEE Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Findings of Noncompliance	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Annual Performance Reports				
• Determination Level	☐	☑	☐	☐

- Determination History

Data Analysis: General Supervision Strengths

A Stakeholder Committee was involved in UCA's Program Improvement Planning (PIP) process. The stakeholder committee consisted of the LEA, Director of Special Education, Assessment Director, General Education teacher, Special Education teacher, State Mentor, a parent, and a student.

An analysis of the RDA APR Indicators, stakeholder input, Previous UPIPS results, On-Site File Compliance Review data, Teacher qualifications, and Caseloads numbers per teacher has identified areas of strengths that include Previous PIP focused on Student Needs, Qualified staff, NIMAC/NIMAS, Fiscal Audits, State and Federal Reporting,Suspensions/Expulsions and Dispute Resolution, and Internal File Compliance Monitoring.

UCA conducts an LEA Internal Review using the UPIPS online program. A representative sample of at least 10% of UCA's files are included in the review.

While reviewing the licenses and qualifications of Special Education teachers, the committee found that 100% of the UCA Special Education teachers currently possess a level one license and are considered HQA in the areas that they teach. UCA has demonstrated strength in qualified staff.

According to the 2016 RDA Indicator data and internal school data, the stakeholder committee determined that Indicator 4: Suspensions and Expulsions are a strength due to the score of 1 (LEA has met state target).

The stakeholder committee reviewed the offerings by UCA and found that Utah Connections Academy utilizes Bookshare in order to provide accessible materials in NIMAC/NIMAS formats. 100% of Connections Academy staff members have completed Professional Development for accessibility training in order to format presentations and curriculum that is aligned with NIMAC/ NIMAS standards. UCA has utilized additional programs that include: NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking as well as Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students.

Fiscal Audit - The Stakeholder Committee reviewed report by Director of Student Services that stated the required independent audit of Fiscal reporting confirmed 100% compliance which is an area of strength. The 2016 RDA letter assigned a risk score of 1 in the "fiscal" area.

In review of the 2016 RDA letter, the stakeholder committee determined that Data Timeliness in submitting reports to the state/federal had a risk score of 1 (met state target). The 2016 letter indicated that 100% of required reports were submitted on or before the deadline. This is an area of strength.

According to the 2016 RDA letter received from the State of Utah, UCA showed strengths in the areas of Internal Monitoring (1) and Dispute Resolution (1). UCA had no State complaints or due process hearing request filed during the 2015-16 school year. All concerns (100%) were successfully addressed and resolved.

According to the 2015-16 LEA Internal Review, UCA showed strengths in the following areas of General Supervision: Current IEP evident in file (100%), Current Eligibility evident file (100%), Length of time for initial evaluation (100%), Evaluation consent (100%); FAPE in LRE: Current IEP (100%), Team Participation (100%), Measureable Goals (100%), Short Term Objectives (100%), Services and Related Services Location/Frequency (100%), Testing Accommodations (100%); Parent Involvement: Consent (100%), Parent Input(100%), Notice of Meeting for Eligibility (100%).

Data Analysis: General Supervision Needs

In the 2016 RDA letter, UCA was placed in the "Needs Assistance" level of determination, with a Tier assignment of "Coaching". Improvement in these levels will be addressed as the result of PIP goals written in the areas of FAPE in the LRE and Transition.

During the review and analysis of data by the stakeholder committee, UCA identified 1 area of need in which action will be taken to improve the general supervision of the special education program at Utah Connections Academy; File Compliance for incoming Special Education files.

The stakeholder committee analyzed the data from internal reviews and determined that IEP timeline compliance has increased from 71% to 89% in the last year. Re-evaluation timelines evident in files has increased from 33% to 57%. Analysis of the root cause determined that the areas of non-compliance were due to incoming files that already contained compliance deficits including missing Eligibility Determination and initial placement documents. Due to the large number of home-schooled students that enroll, there are many IEP's that were found to be more than 2 years out of compliance. There were also several files reviewed that included data that supported the lack of compliance of more than one cycle on behalf of the sending district. As a result, an action step has been included in Goal 2 that involves a file review of each incoming file as well as 10% of existing files.

Previous Years SMART-C Goals

Goal 1

Student Outcomes

Resource Category:

Status: Continuing

SMART-C Goal: UCA will increase performance scores in ELA and Math by 5% overall as measured by the 2016 SAGE test scores and/or Leap/Scantron test scores.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will monitor the LEAP/Scantron 3x yearly in order to analyze progress.

Action Steps: In order to increase the ELA proficiency, UCA will increase enrollment in supplemental instructional programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction. In order to increase the Math proficiency, UCA will increase enrollment in supplemental instructional programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction.

Year 2015-2016 Progress:

Pre-test scores for LEAP/Scantron testing in September. Results define number of students that are Likely to be Proficient, Unlikely to be Proficient and Not Tested. For LEAP (K-8), 46% ELA and 24% Math are Likely to be proficient, For Scantron, 44% ELA and 16% Math are Likely to be proficient.

Adjustment to pre-test scores taken in September as all of the students had not completed the test at the time data was submitted. For LEAP, 39% ELA with 68% tested and 67% Math with 66% tested are likely to be proficient. For Scantron, 74% ELA with 46% tested and 55% Math with 49% tested are Likely to be proficient.

Mid-year Assessment report in January/February. Results define number of students that are Likely to be Proficient, Unlikely to be Proficient, and Not tested. For LEAP (K-8), 55% ELA with 62% tested and 61% Math with 68% tested are Likely to be Proficient. For Scantron (9-12), 71% ELA with 41% tested and 58% Math with 46% tested are Likely to be Proficient.

Attachment shows comparison scores for pre-test and midyear test.

ELA and Math Proficiency

LEAP (reading) posttest scores; reflect that 36% of SWD in grades 3-8 did not take the posttest. Of the 64% that did take the ELA posttest, 30% were Likely to be proficient, 36% May be likely to be proficient and 30% were Unlikely to be proficient. Leap (math) posttest scores; reflect that 42% did not take the posttest. Of the 58% that did take the Math posttest, 23% were Likely to be proficient, 43% May be proficient and 33% were Unlikely to be proficient. Engagement in LEAP testing has declined by 10% for ELA and 2% for Math since the beginning of the school year. Overall, ELA scores have increased by 27% and Math has declined by 3%. The increase in ELA scores reflects implementation of reading focus and instruction by single subject focus for Special Education teachers. The transition of the math teachers and inconsistency in math planning could possibly be the root cause for the decline in math scores.

Scantron (Reading) posttest scores; reflect that 64% of SWD in grades 9-11 did not take the posttest. Of the 36% that did take the ELA posttest, 69% were Likely or May be proficient, 31% were Unlikely to be proficient. Of the 39% that took the Scantron (math) posttest, 41% were Likely or May be proficient, and 59% were Unlikely to be proficient. Engagement in the Scantron assessments has declined by 10% across both subjects from the pretest. Overall, the ELA scores have declined by 5% and the Math scores declined by 14% from pretest to posttest. The lack of a supplemental instructional programming may possibly be the root cause for the decline in ELA scores for the upper grades. The transition of new math teachers and the implementation of a new math program in the middle of the year could possibly be the root cause in the decline in math scores.

EOY SAGE testing showed a sharp decline in proficiency scores for Special Education students. Sage for the end of SY 14-15 were an average of 12% proficient across 9 GLs and above the State average for SWD in 6 GLs. SY 15-16 were an average of 2% proficient across 9 GLs and did not meet State average for SWD statewide. This decline could be attributed to the changes in programming that were initiated during the 15-16 SY. The program implementation included Special Education Homerooms in order to Special Education teachers to have more direct impact on students. In the data analysis based on number of contacts per teacher, it became evident that the contacts between Special Education teachers and students increased, but the contacts between General Education teachers and students dramatically declined. The reduction of contacts between Content Area teachers and Special Education students could be a possible root cause for the decline in SAGE scores. For the next school year, and in the future, SWD will not be placed in Special Education Homerooms exclusively.

Attached data spreadsheets for LEAP, Scantron and SAGE.

This goal will be continued in FAPE in LRE for the SY 16-17.

Year 2016-2017 Progress: <p style="margin-bottom:0px;padding-right:0px;padding-left:0px;border:0px;outline:0px;background:border-box border-box rgb(255, 255, 255);font-family:Arial, Helvetica, 'Helvetica Neue', sans-serif;font-size:14px;line-height:18px;box-sizing:content-box;-webkit-background-clip:border-box;">This goal now appears in FAPE in LRE.</p>

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 2

File Compliance Monitoring

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: During the 16-17 SY, UCA will increase file compliance (IEP timelines to 100% compliance, Re-evaluation timelines to 100% compliance) for all incoming files and 10% of overall existing files as measured by LEA Internal Review findings.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will review the LEA Internal Review compliance summary and individual student noncompliance (for compliance and to ensure that files of all incoming students and 10% of total student files were reviewed) according to the dates for review.

Action Steps: UCA will also conduct an LEA Internal Review using the program through UPIPS website for each incoming file (in addition to 10% of existing files) to identify areas of correction needed. UCA will create an internal IssueAware ticket to monitor all incoming files, compile a list of corrections and describe due dates to ensure File Compliance. UCA will communicate all internal file corrections through ongoing Touchbase meetings with case managers and internal IssueAware tickets.

General Supervision LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionseducation.com	Goal 2

General Supervision Dates for Review

03/15/2017

General Supervision Communication Log

From Wade Glathar on 7/22/2016 3:53:46 PM

Thank you for submitting your PIP. Your efforts are much appreciated! We have reviewed your PIP and approved it. Your overall PIP score is: 1. We do not recommend any changes at this time.

General Supervision Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
1/12/2016 9:06:02 PM	LEAP Statisitics Grades K-8 (CA)11.25.15.xlsx
1/12/2016 9:06:11 PM	Scantron Statisitics Grades 9-12 11.25.15.xlsx
3/28/2016 4:05:46 PM	Midyear Assessment UPIPS Report.xlsx
6/24/2016 6:40:03 PM	EOY LEAP Sped Data.xlsx
6/24/2016 6:40:09 PM	EOY Scantron Sped Data.xlsx
6/24/2016 6:40:11 PM	SAGE UCA State SWD comparison.xlsx

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY FAPE in the LRE Program Improvement Plan (2015-2016)

FAPE in the LRE Data Sources

- ☑ APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6
- ☐ Previous UPIPS Results
- ☐ Interview Responses
- ☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Individualized Education Program				
• Accommodations	☐	☑	☑	☐
• IEP and Placement	☐	☐	☐	☐
• PLAAFP & Goals	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Service Delivery	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Extended School Year	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Health Care Plan	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Related Services	☑	☐	☐	☐
• IEP Team Membership	☑	☐	☐	☐
• EL Evaluations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge & Effective Instruction				
• Numeracy - Indicator 3	☐	☑	☑	☑
• Literacy - Indicator 3	☐	☑	☑	☐
• Preschool Outcomes - Indicator 7	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Accessible Instructional Technology & Materials	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Access to the General Curriculum - Indicator 5	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Preschool Settings - Indicator 6	☐	☐	☐	☐
• LRE and Placement	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Paraprofessionals				
• Training and Supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in Secondary Settings				
• Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports Available in All Settings	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Behavior/Discipline Procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
• EL Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• IEP Timelines	☐	☑	☑	☐

Data Analysis: FAPE in the LRE Strengths

The stakeholder sub-committee; gen ed teacher and principal, reviewed the data of APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, previous UPIPS results, and discussed findings. They have identified areas of strengths that include: Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials, Access to the General Curriculum as well as LRE in Placement decisions, and IEP compliance in the areas of Related Services and IEP Team Membership.

The stakeholder committee found that in order to provide Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials, Utah Connections Academy utilizes Bookshare, NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking, Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. Curriculum can be modified specifically to each student's needs and is available throught the educational management system to all team members. Instruction is provided through LiveLesson classroom from the Gen Ed teachers as well as the Special Education teachers. Small group and one-on-one instruction is available through the same means. Students have access to all other means of communication through the educational management system via Message Boards, webmails, and phone calls with teachers. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students.

The stakeholder committee reviewed the offerings by UCA and found that Utah Connections Academy utilizes Bookshare in order to provide accessible materials in NIMAC/NIMAS formats. Connections Academy has completed Professional Development for accessibility training in order to format presentations and curriculum that is aligned with NIMAC/ NIMAS standards. UCA has utilized additional programs that include: NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking as well as Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students.

Individual Education Programs- Based on the data from the internal monitoring compliance report, UCA has demonstrated strengths in the areas of Current IEP evident in file (100%), Current Eligibility evident in file (100%), Service Delivery (100%), Related Services (100%), Extended School

Year (100%), and Placement (100%). Based on the On-Site File Compliance Review, UCA has demonstrated strengths in the areas of PLAAFP and Goals (100%), Related Services (100%), and IEP Team Membership (100%).

Access to the General Curriculum-According to state reports, 89% of enrolled students particpate in the General Curriculum. Only 11% of enrolled students spend more than 60% of their educational time with Special Education Teachers and specialized curriculum. UCA received a risk score of "1" in the 2016 RDA letter for Indicator 5: Access to the General Curriculum. UCA met the state target in all three areas of Indicator 5.

Retaining Students numbers - According to enrollment records, UCA retained enrollment of 40.26% of Special Education students enrolled at the end of the 12-13 SY, 40.37% at the end of the 13-14 SY with 22.08% of additional students returning from the 12-13 SY. According to the Intent to Return (ITR) survey, UCA expected returning students for the 14-15 SY at 74.00% of currently enrolled students. The current (15-16 SY) ITR data suggests that 64% of students will be returning next year with only 6% not returning and 31% still undecided. UCA will continue to monitor trend and determine needs, if applicable, in the future.

Data Analysis: FAPE in the LRE Needs

At the conclusion of the 14-15 school year, students participated in the SAGE Assessment. Overall composite scores show the following proficiency rates in ELA 11.3%, Math 16% and 17.4% for Science. This demonstrated an increase in ELA and Math, but a decrease in Science. SAGE assessment scores for ELA range from 0%-25%. These ELA scores are At or Above State average for SWD statewide in 6 of the 9 grades. The 2016 RDA letter indicated a risk score of 5 for Literacy: Grades 3-8 (9.09%) and a risk score of 4 for Literacy: Grade 10 (7/14%).SAGE assessment scores for Math range from 0%-50% and are At or Above State average for SWD statewide in 5 of the 9 grades. However, these scores as still below the average state proficiency for all students and identified as an area of concern. According to review by stakeholder committee, RDA indicators demonstrated an increase in proficiency for students in the area of Math. Performance increased from 0% to 15.63% in Numeracy in Grades 3-8 (Risk score of 3) and 0% to 22.22% in Numeracy in Grade 10 (Risk score of 1). The stakeholder committee and State Mentor identified possible root causes for current proficiency levels to be the lack of access to supplemental instruction programs, and the lack of tiered interventions, as well as the need for more explicit instruction in Tier 1. Professional development for all staff members has been arranged though the UPDN (beginning May 2016) and UCA's professional development will be featured at the 2016 NASDSE Conference in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Accommodations- According to the UCA survey responses from Gen Ed teachers and parents there is a lack of consistent implementation of accommodations across the curriculum. It was determined that the root cause is the lack of a communication tool between Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers regarding the needed accommodations for individual students and the application to specific content areas. Last year's goal (Goal 1) will be continued in this area, with an action step that addresses a communication tool to resolve the issue of consistency in the delivery of accommodations.

The stakeholder committee analyzed the data from internal reviews and determined that IEP timeline compliance has increased from 71% to 89% in the past year. Although this showed a significant increase, since the required level of compliance is 100%, this area has been included in Goal 2 of General Supervision (File Compliance Monitoring).

Previous Years SMART-C Goals

Goal 1

Accommodations/Behaviors

Resource Category:

Status: Continuing

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 School year,UCA will increase the implementation and consistency of delivery of accommodations across all courses form 52% to 80% annually as measured by interview and survey data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Surveys conducted 3x yearly to assess consistency of implementation and student/parent satisfaction.

Action Steps: UCA will create an IA (Issue Aware) ticket for each student that requires accommodations/behavior interventions as a communication tool between team members. UCA will also implement a professional development timeline to provide training on the topics of Special Education referral process, eligibility criteria, accommodations and modifications strategies, behavioral concerns and intervention implementation and documentation procedures.

Year 2015-2016 Progress:

Professional Development for 100% of the faculty (8/4/15, 8/5/15, 2/5/16) included Accommodations/Modifications for Content Areas, Identification, Evaluation and Classification for Special Education students.

UCA implemented parent and student surveys to determine level of satisfaction regarding delivery of accommodations. Parent survey showed improvement in Parent's perception of Gen Ed teachers awareness of child's learning needs to 80%. Areas of concern were collaboration between teachers at 56% and consistently implemented accommodations and modifications in Gen Ed at 63%. Student survey showed improvement in Students receiving additional help at 89%, however lower scores in availability of alternative response formats in Gen Ed at 33%. A final survey will be sent in May to help determine if the "IA" communication tool has been successful or if it needs to be improved.

Communication between Special Education teachers and Content Area teachers has increased. An internal communication protocol that enabled teachers to discuss accommodations for each student virtually was implemented successfully. Teacher survey was conducted to determine if the protocol had ease of use and was effective for addressing the accommodation needs of the students. The teacher survey results were:

Question	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Minimal	Poor
Communication	45%	36%	18%	0	0

Comprehension/Tasks	36%	54%	9%	0	0
IA's Effective/Timely	45%	45%	5%	0	5%
IEP Meetings Inclusive	64%	36%	0	0	0
Admin Response	45%	45%	5%	5%	0
Effective Training	55%	18%	23%	4%	0

Overall, teacher satisfaction with the communication tool was high. Teacher suggestions include deadlines for communications and accommodations, more pertinent information about students in the internal memos and support in choosing appropriate accommodations. It was also suggested that training specific to subject area accommodations be presented. Possible improvements to the communication protocols is to set staffing meetings monthly to discuss specific students, set deadlines for accommodation implementation in content areas, and accountability of teachers to deliver accommodations to students.

This goal will be retained for the 2016-17 school year.

Year 2016-2017 Progress: Goal #5 will contain progress reporting.

Goal 2

Drop Out Rate

Resource Category:

Status: Continuing

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 school year, UCA will decrease the drop out rate for students grades 9-12 by 5% as measured by the end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Track process of all withdrawing students through DataViews and student's home district.

Action Steps: UCA will implement a monitoring process for students that withdraw to insure and encourage participation in traditional or non-traditional settings for completing graduation requirements as measured by state reporting of drop out rates.

Year 2015-2016 Progress:

Tracking IssueAware (IA) internal memo for student withdrawal has been implemented and reviewed monthly. Final data will not be available until the end of the school year. Progress report will be updated at that time.

This will be updated with the state EOY APR report that is based on statewide data collection. The estimate of dropout rates is based on 15-16 student count of 100 students in grades 7-12th. Of the 100 students, 10 withdrew and enrolled in successive schools, 12 withdrew with no successive school, and 78 are listed as returning students. The annual dropout rate for grades 7-12th is **12%** based on the enrolled students (100) grades 7-12th and the number of withdrawals with no successive schools listed (12).

For 2016 PIP, Goal is located in Transition Section.

Year 2016-2017 Progress: This goal is located in the Transition Section.

Goal 3

Graduation

Resource Category:

Status: Continuing

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 school year, UCA will increase students graduating with cohort peers by 5% as measured by end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Grades and credits earned.

Action Steps: UCA will increase focus on graduation w/i cohort year by providing additional resources and opportunities for students to engage in transition planning and goal setting during transition classes in order to create a path to graduation as measured by graduation rates in the end of year data.

Year 2015-2016 Progress:

Pathway to Graduation worksheet has been implemented, reviewed during IEP meetings, added to student's IssueAware (IA) and reviewed with content area teachers. Tracking of cohort grades and credits for 12th graders is reviewed by Sped, Gen Ed and Administration. Final data will not be available until the end of the school year. Progress will be updated at that time.

According to internal data monitoring, 90% of on-cohort seniors, identified as students with disabilities, are projected to graduate on time for the 15-16 SY.

The implementation of the Pathway to Graduation program was highly successful this year. UCA showed 15 enrolled seniors during the school year. Of those 15 students, 1 student withdrew to home school, 3 withdrew with no successive school listed and 11 graduated. Over the 7-12thgrade enrollment, 100 students were enrolled during the 15-16 school year. Of the 100 students, 10 withdrew and enrolled in successive schools, 12 withdrew with no successive school, and 78 are listed as returning students. The percentage of graduating seniors is **73%**based on the 15-16 yearly student count.

For 2016 PIP, Goal is located in Transition Section.

Year 2016-2017 Progress: This goal is now located in the Transition section.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 4

Student Outcomes

Resource Category: Numeracy - Indicator 3,Literacy - Indicator 3,

SMART-C Goal: UCA will increase performance scores in ELA and Math by 5% overall as measured by the 2016 SAGE test scores and/or Leap/Scantron test scores.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will monitor scores in ELA and Math in LEAP/Scantron 3X yearly in order to analyze progress toward EOY summative assessments.

Action Steps: In order to increase the ELA proficiency, UCA will increase enrollment in supplemental instruction programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction. In order to increase the Math proficiency, UCA will increase enrollment in supplemental instruction programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction. The UPDN will provide professional development in the area of numeracy for all staff members.

Goal 5

Accommodations/Behaviors

Resource Category: Accommodations,

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 School year,UCA will increase the implementation and consistency of delivery of accommodations across all courses form 52% to 80% annually as measured by interview and survey data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Surveys conducted 2x yearly to assess consistency of implementation and student/parent satisfaction.

Action Steps: UCA will create an IA (Issue Aware) ticket for each student that requires accommodations/behavior interventions as a communication tool between team members. UCA will also implement a professional development timeline to provide training on the topics of Special Education referral process, eligibility criteria, accommodations and modifications strategies, behavioral concerns and intervention implementation and documentation procedures

---

FAPE in the LRE LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectioneducation.com	Goal 4
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionseducation.com	Goal 5

FAPE in the LRE Dates for Review

11/30/2016

03/15/2017

FAPE in the LRE Communication Log

FAPE in the LRE Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
1/12/2016 8:06:25 PM	UPIPS Surveys Parent.Students November.xlsx
1/12/2016 8:09:49 PM	Pathway to Graduation Worksheet.xlsx

| 1/12/2016 9:36:46 PM | Faculty Professional Development for UPIPS.docx |
| 6/24/2016 6:45:05 PM | End of Year Survey Teachers UPIPS.csv |

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Disproportionality Program Improvement Plan (2015-2016)

Disproportionality Data Sources

☑ APR Indicators 9, 10

☐ Child count data to review prevalence and categories of disabilities by race/ethnicity

(Hover Titles for Info)	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
• Disproportionate Representation - Indicator 9	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Disproportionate Representation by Disability Category - Indicator 10	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Disproportionality Strengths

According to the 2016 RDA letter, UCA was assigned a risk score of 1 for Indicators 9 & 10. There is zero percent disproportionality suspected within the LEA.

Data Analysis: Disproportionality Needs

No needs identified.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Disproportionality LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Disproportionality Dates for Review

Disproportionality Communication Log

Disproportionality Evidence Upload

Date	File Name

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Parent Involvement Program Improvement Plan (2015-2016)

Parent Involvement Data Sources

- ☐ APR Indicator 8
- ☑ Previous UPIPS Results
- ☐ Interview Responses
- ☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
• Communication				
• Parent Survey - Indicator 8	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Communication in a Variety of Languages	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Emergency Contact Procedures (LRBI)	☑	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
• Procedural Safeguards				
• Copies to Parents	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Written Prior Notice	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Notice of Meeting	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Parental Consent	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Surrogate Parents	☐	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Parent Involvement Strengths

The stakeholder committee analyzed the data from the internal and external (USOE) file reviews. They identified a number of areas of strengths. According to the LEA Internal Review, the following areas were at 100% compliance: parental consent for evaluation and notice of IEP meeting. The external (USOE on site monitoring) compliance summary indicates that the areas of parent consent for initial evaluation, notice of meeting for eligibility, parent input for determining eligibility and notice of IEP meeting provided to adult student all showed 100% compliance.

Communication in various languages- Utah Connections Academy utilizes forms available on the state website in various languages if needed. UCA also has the availability of translation programs through Google apps to translate in writing documents in a variety of languages. If needed, UCA has access, through Connections Education (parent corp), to translation services through professional firms.

Emergency Contact procedures (LRBI)- Utah Connections Academy utilizes the LRBI manual provided by the state for all behavioral issues that may present itself with current and future students. This document contains the Emergency Contact form as well as the guidelines.

Data Analysis: Parent Involvement Needs
No needs identified.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Parent Involvement LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Parent Involvement Dates for Review

Parent Involvement Communication Log

Parent Involvement Evidence Upload

Date	File Name

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Transition Program Improvement Plan (2015-2016)

Transition Data Sources

☑ APR Indicators 7, 12, 13, 14
☑ Previous UPIPS Results
☐ Interview Responses
☐ TEDI data
☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Priority Area 1: High Expectations & Beliefs				
Graduation - Indicator 1	☐	☑	☑	☐
Dropout - Indicator 2	☐	☑	☑	☐
Post Secondary Outcomes - Indicator 14	☐	☑	☐	☐
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge & Effective Instruction				
Secondary Transition Evidence-based Practices & Predictors of Post-school Success	☐	☐	☐	☐
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in Secondary Settings				
Interagency Involvement and Collaboration	☐	☐	☐	☐
School Programs to Encourage Parent Involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic Rigor for All Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
A Network of Timely Supports	☐	☐	☐	☐
A Culture of College Access	☐	☐	☐	☐
Effective Use of Data	☐	☐	☐	☐
General Supervision				
School to Post School Transition				
Complete Secondary Transition Plans - Indicator 13				
Transition Plans by 16th Birthday	☑	☐	☐	☐
Post Secondary Goals	☐	☐	☐	☐
Age Appropriate Transition Assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transition Services	☐	☐	☐	☐
Courses of Study	☐	☐	☐	☐
Age of Majority	☑	☐	☐	☐
Summary of Performance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Notice to Adult Students	☐	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Transition Strengths

While compiling data and reviewing areas, it was decided that the APR indicators 6, 7, and 12 apply to a preschool program. UCA does not have a preschool program currently.

In analyzing the data collected and discussion with the stakeholders committee, several areas of strength were identified in the area of School-to-Post-School Transition.

Transition Plans by 16th birthday- According to internal and external (USOE on site) reviews, UCA has 100% compliance with completing a transition plan by the student's 16th birthday. Each file reviewed contained a transition plan. As a result, UCA received a risk score (2016 RDA letter) of 1 for Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Plans.

Age Appropriate Transition Assessments - According to the USOE on site visit, 67% of files reviewed contained age appropriate assessments. According to the internal review of digital files, however, 100% of transition age students answered transition assessments prior to the IEP meeting.

Age of Majority Rights - According to the Internal and external reviews, UCA had 100% compliance with providing students and parents the information regarding the Age of Majority rights during the IEP meeting at least one year before the student's 18th birthday.

Notice to Students/ Adult Students - According to the external compliance review, UCA determined that 89% of students/adult students were invited to the IEP meeting; however internal monitoring demonstrated that 100% of students/adult students attended the meeting and received all required documents.

Data Analysis: Transition Needs

In analyzing the APR annual data, Previous UPIPS results and interview responses, the stakeholder committee has identified areas of need in order to increase the number of special education students that graduate.

According to the 2016 RDA report, UCA received a score of 5 for indicator # 14 Post Secondary Outcomes (Enrollment/Employment). UCA had 0% of students respond to post graduation phone survey (UCA had one applicable student in 12-13, 2 students in 13-14). The stakeholder committee conducted a self-assessment and identified a possible root cause as the unfamiliarity of the students with the process and recognition of the originators of the phone call. Due to the small "n" size, UCA will participate in the USOE survey by attending training and providing follow-up assistance for any phone calls not answered during the USOE survey. If future data (after UCA's implements involvement in the phone survey) indicate that there is still a need in this area, a goal will be established.

According to the 2016 RDA letter, UCA has a risk score of 5 for Indicator 2: Dropouts and a drop out percentage of 83.33%. The stakeholder committee determined that the root cause is miscoding errors while inputting data into state reporting system, lack of monitoring withdrawn students as to whether they have enrolled in other schools (tracking forward) as well as lack of accommodations for students (addressed as a goal in FAPE in LRE) within CA coursework. "Out of cohort" seniors, who count as dropouts, are continuing enrollment and still plan on graduating.

The 2016 RDA letter indicated a risk score of 5: Graduation with 25% of students in the 13-14 data year. The remaining out of cohort seniors are continuing enrollment and still plan on graduating. At the end of 15-16 SY, 90% (9 of 10)of on-cohort seniors are projected to graduate on time.

Previous Years SMART-C Goals

Goal 1

Post-secondary goals

Resource Category:

Status: Completed

SMART-C Goal: UCA will complete professional development training for special education transition teachers to ensure increasing compliance in the area of coordinating post-secondary transition goals with relation to IEP goals with 100% accuracy as measured by internal/external file review monitoring through UPIPS website.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Internal file review monitoring 3x per 15-16 school year.

Action Steps: UCA will create a timeline for monthly training meetings that includes compliance of special education transition plans. UCA will monitor file review compliance of special education transition plans during the 3x yearly review of files.

Year 2015-2016 Progress:

UCA implemented training to transition planning for all special education teachers that was ongoing throughout the year. Initial training was held in September, 2015. Training was completed on 10/23/15, 1/8/16, and 3/11/16.

According to Compliance Summary: UCA was at 100% compliance for Annual IEP goals related to transition services needs according to the LEA Internal Review. According to the USOE on site review, UCA showed a compliance rate of 89%. Although UCA did not reach a 100% compliance rate during the on-site review, procedures and form changes were implemented after the on site review that has corrected this issue. Therefore, UCA considers this goal to be completed.

Goal 2

Graduation

Resource Category:

Status: Continuing

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 school year, UCA will increase students graduating with cohort peers by 5% as measured by end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will monitor grades and credits for anticipated graduation.

Action Steps: UCA will increase focus on graduation, w/i cohort year, by providing a Pathway to Graduation program that will target instruction in areas that include: interest inventories, career exploration and planning, life skills and study skills, resume building and college application support.

Year 2015-2016 Progress:

Pathway to Graduation worksheet has been implemented, reviewed during IEP meetings, added to student's IssueAware (IA) and reviewed with content area teachers. Tracking of cohort grades and credits for 12th graders is reviewed by Sped, Gen Ed and Administration. Final data

will not be available until the end of the school year. Progress will be updated at that time.

According to internal data monitoring, 90% of on-cohort seniors, identified as students with disabilities, are projected to graduate on time for the 15-16 SY.

The implementation of the Pathway to Graduation program was highly successful this year. UCA showed 15 enrolled seniors during the school year. Of those 15 students, 1 student withdrew to home school, 3 withdrew with no successive school listed and 11 graduated. Over the 7-12thgrade enrollment, 100 students were enrolled during the 15-16 school year. Of the 100 students, 10 withdrew and enrolled in successive schools, 12 withdrew with no successive school, and 78 are listed as returning students. The percentage of graduating seniors is **73%**based on the 15-16 yearly student count.

Year 2016-2017 Progress: <p>Utah Connections Academy has created a tracking system for students withdrawing from our school in order to track student progress forward. Graduation rate has increased from 30% to 50% during the 15-16 school year. Although this met the LEA goal, it did not meet the state target. </p><p>Goal will be discontinued in order to update the language of the goal. The effort to increase graduation rates will continue within the new goal.</p>

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 3

Drop Out Rate

Resource Category: Dropout - Indicator 2,

SMART-C Goal: During the 16-17 school year, UCA will decrease the drop out rate for students grades 9-12 by 5% as measured by the end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Track process of all withdrawing students through DataViews and student's home district.

Action Steps: UCA will implement a monitoring process for students that withdraw to insure and encourage participation in traditional or non-traditional settings for completing graduation requirements as measured by state reporting of drop out rates.

Goal 4

Graduation

Resource Category: Graduation - Indicator 1,

SMART-C Goal: During the 16-17 school year, UCA will increase students graduating with cohort peers by 5% as measured by end of year data

Progress Monitoring Plan: Grades and credits earned as listed on the Gradebook, transcript and Pathway to Graduation worksheet.

Action Steps: UCA will increase focus on graduation w/i cohort year by providing additional resources and opportunities for students to engage in transition planning and goal setting during transition classes in order to create a path to graduation as measured by graduation rates in the end of year data.

Goal 5

Post Secondary Outcomes

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: UCA will increase the outcomes of students in all three areas of (Ind #14) Post Secondary Outcomes by 50% the end of the 16-17 school year.

Progress Monitoring Plan: The RDA information provided by the State.

Action Steps: 1. Attend training for Post Secondary Outcomes Survey provided by the USOE Special Education Department. 2. Conduct post secondary surveys with graduating seniors internally and submit results to the state office. 3. Continue to provide Pathway to Graduation discussions, field trips and career exploration as part of the transition service planning.

Transition LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Transition Dates for Review

11/30/2016

Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionseducation.com	Goal 3	03/15/2017
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionseducation.com	Goal 4	
Susan Pearl-Weese	801-298-6660	spearlweese@connectionseducation.com	Goal 5	

Transition Communication Log

From Tiffanie Owens on 5/10/2016 8:31:11 PM

Please address Indicator 14 - post secondary outcomes through a self-assessment and action step as indicated in your RDA letter.

Transition Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
1/12/2016 8:55:57 PM	Sped Professional Development for UPIPS.docx
1/12/2016 9:39:58 PM	Pathway to Graduation Worksheet.xlsx

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY General Supervision Program Improvement Plan (2014-2015)

General Supervision Data Sources

- ☑ APR Indicators, 3, 11
- ☑ Stakeholder input
- ☑ Previous UPIPS Results
- ☑ Interview Responses
- ☑ Off-site data
- ☑ Teacher licenses, endorsements and highly qualified status for current assignments
- ☑ Caseloads of special education case manages
- ☑ Policies and procedures in place and followed LEA-wide
- ☑ Student progress data
- ☐ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
Leadership/Administration				
• Qualified Staff	☑	☐	☐	☐
• State-wide Assessment	☐	☑	☑	☐
• Professional Development	☑	☐	☐	☐
• NIMAC/NIMAS	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Policies and Procedures	☑	☐	☐	☐
Finance				
• Fiscal Audit	☑	☐	☐	☐
Data				
• State and Federal Reports	☑	☐	☐	☐
Compliance and Legal Issues				
• Child Find	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Referral Process	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Dispute Resolution				
• Complaint and Due Process	☑	☐	☐	☐
Compliance Monitoring				
• Evaluation Materials	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Confidentiality	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Evaluation/Eligibility Procedures	☑	☐	☐	☐
• English Proficiency Assessments	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Forms	☑	☐	☐	☐
• IEE Procedures	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Initial Evaluation/Reevaluation Timelines	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: General Supervision Strengths

UCA utilized a steering committe for the program improvement process consisting of the following members: one general education teacher, one special education teacher, one manager of special education services, one special education director, one mentor from the state, one principal, one parent, and one student.

An analysis of the APR Indicators, stakeholder input, Previous UPIPS results, Interview responses, Off-site data, Teacher qualifications, Caseloads numbers per teacher, Policies and Procedures, and Student progress data has identified areas of strengths that include Qualified staff, Policy and Procedure compliance, Professional Development, NIMAC/NIMAS, Fiscal Audits, State and Federal Reporting, Child Find procedures, Referral processes, Compliance Monitoring, and Dispute Resolution.

While reviewing the licenses and qualifications of Special Education teachers, the committee found that 100% of the UCA Special Education teachers currently possess a level one license and are considered HQA in the areas that they teach. UCA has demonstrated strength in qualified staff.

After state review, UCA has an approved updated Policy and Procedure manual that is aligned with State Rules and Regulations.

In reviewing evidence of Professional Development offered by Ca and UCA, the stakeholder committee found that UCA has demonstrated strength in the area of Professional Development by offering and completing PD surrounding Compliance, SIOP, Transition and other issues specific to implementing direct services for Special Education students.

The stakeholder committee reviewed the offerings by UCA and found that Utah Connections Academy utilizes Bookshare in order to provide accessible materials in NIMAC/NIMAS formats. Connections Academy has completed Professional Development for accessibility training in order to format presentations and curriculum that is aligned with NIMAC/ NIMAS standards. UCA has utilized additional programs that include: NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking as well as Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students.

Fiscal Audit - Sub-Committee reviewed report by Director of Student Services that stated the required independent audit of Fiscal reporting confirmed 100% compliance.

According to the RDA letter received from the State of Utah, UCA showed strengths in the areas of Internal Monitoring (1) and Dispute Resolution (1).

According to the 2014-15 LEA Internal Review, UCA showed strengths in the areas of Initial Evaluation: Current Eligibility (100%), Eligibility Criteria: Autism (100%), Evaluation Criteria: SLI (100%) and SLD-Discrepancy (100%).

UCA had no State complaint or due process hearing request filed during the 2014-15 school year. All concerns (100%) were successfully addressed and resolved.

Data Analysis: General Supervision Needs

During the review and analysis of data by the stakeholder committee, we identified 1 areas of need in which action will be taken to improve the general supervision of the special education program at Utah Connections Academy; State Wide Assessment performance and participation.

At the conclusion of the 13-14 school year, students participated in the SAGE Assessment for the first time. Overall composite scores show the following proficiency rates in ELA 10.2%, Math 8.9% and 28.9% for Science. The sub-committee, principal, Sped Director and State Mentor, identified possible root causes to be the unfamiliar testing format for students and teachers, lack of preparation of students for test taking strategies, the lack of understanding of implementation of accommodations by teachers for the students. It is important to note that all districts throughout Utah performed lower on the SAGE testing this first year than previously on the State CRT tests.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 1

Student Outcomes

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: UCA will increase performance scores in ELA and Math by 5% overall as measured by the 2016 SAGE test scores and/or Leap/Scantron test scores.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will monitor the LEAP/Scantron 3x yearly in order to analyze progress.

Action Steps: In order to increase the ELA proficiency, UCA will increase enrollment in supplemental instructional programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction. In order to increase the Math proficiency, UCA will increase enrollment in supplemental instructional programs that will provide deficit skill identification for targeted small group specialized instruction.

General Supervision LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

General Supervision Dates for Review

General Supervision Communication Log

General Supervision Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
5/30/2015 6:25:33 PM	Compliance Summary Report UPIPS.xlsx
5/30/2015 6:26:42 PM	EOL Scores Annual 14.xlsx
5/30/2015 6:29:38 PM	Survey Parent spreadsheet 4.24.15.xls
5/30/2015 6:29:50 PM	Survey Sped Spreadsheet.xls
5/30/2015 6:30:19 PM	Survey Student spreadsheet.xlsx.xls
5/30/2015 6:30:39 PM	Survey Sped Director Spreadsheet.xls
5/30/2015 6:30:58 PM	RDA-UTAH-CONNECTIONS-ACADEMY_Initial_2-25-2015.pdf

5/30/2015 6:31:45 PM	Survey Gen Ed Spreadsheet.xls
5/30/2015 6:32:16 PM	UCA UPIPS Meeting Agendas 14-15.docx
5/30/2015 6:32:29 PM	UCA UPIPS Review Strengths and Weaknesses 12-13.docx
5/30/2015 6:35:38 PM	Stakeholder Input.pptx
5/30/2015 6:35:49 PM	UCA PP Manual Approved 4 6 15.docx
5/30/2015 6:36:28 PM	UCA UPIPS Improvement Plan 13-14 with Updates.docx
3/28/2016 4:06:45 PM	Midyear Assessment UPIPS Report.xlsx

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY FAPE in the LRE Program Improvement Plan (2014-2015)

FAPE in the LRE Data Sources

☑ APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6
☑ Previous UPIPS Results
☑ Interview Responses
☐ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
• Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Accommodations	☐	☑	☑	☑
• Behavior/Discipline	☐	☑	☑	☑
Individualized Education Program				
• Extended School Year	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Health Care Plan	☑	☐	☐	☐
• IEP and Placement Timelines	☐	☑	☑	☑
• IEP Team Membership	☑	☐	☐	☐
• PLAAFP and Goals	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Related Services	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Service Delivery	☑	☐	☐	☐
Instruction				
• Access to the General Curriculum	☑	☐	☐	☐
• LRE and Placement	☑	☐	☐	☐
Paraprofessional Educators				
• Training and Supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: FAPE in the LRE Strengths

The stakeholder sub-committee; gen ed teacher and principal, reviewed the data of APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, previous UPIPS results, and interview responses and discussed findings. They have identified areas of strengths that include: Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials, Access to the General Curriculum as well as LRE in Placement decisions, and IEP compliance in the areas of PLAAFP and goals, Service Delivery, Related Services, Extended School Year, File Compliance Timelines and IEP Team Membership.

The sub-committee found that in order to provide Accessible Instructional Technology and Materials, Utah Connections Academy utilizes Bookshare, NaturalReader, Snap&Read, Dragon Naturally Speaking, Google apps for Text to Speech and Speech to text in order to provide accessibility for materials as soon as possible. Curriculum can be modified specifically to each student's needs and is available throught the educational management system to all team members. Instruction is provided through LiveLesson classroom from the Gen Ed teachers as well as the Special Education teachers. Small group and one-on-one instruction is available through the same means. Students have access to all other means of communication through the educational management system via Message Boards, webmails, and phone calls with teachers. This demonstrates a strength in the area of accessibility for all students.

Individual Education Programs- Based on the data from the internal monitoring compliance report, UCA has demonstrated strengths in the areas of PLAAFP and Goals (86%), Service Delivery (100%), Related Services (100%), Extended School Year (100%), Health Care Plans (N/A), Placement (100%), and IEP Team Membership (86%).

Access to the General Curriculum-According to state reports, 91% of enrolled students particpate in the General Curriculum. Only 9% of enrolled students spend more than 60% of their educational time with Special Education Teachers and specialized curriculum.

Retaining Students numbers - According to enrollment records, UCA retained enrollment of 40.26% of Special Education students enrolled at the end of the 12-13 SY, 40.37% at the end of the 13-14 SY with 22.08% of additional students returning from the 12-13 SY. According to the Intent to Return survey, UCA expected returning students for the 14-15 SY is 74.00% of currently enrolled students. The trend to retain enrollment of Special Education Students for UCA has increased by more than 20% yearly over 3 years. UCA will continue to monitor trend and determine needs, if applicable, in the future.

Data Analysis: FAPE in the LRE Needs

Accommodations- According to the responses from Gen Ed teachers (56% for understanding of accommodations applications and 63% for training on Special Education processes and implementation) and parents (66.6% accommodations consistently implemented and 52.4% students receiving all accommodations prescribed by the IEP). It was determined that the root cause is the lack of communication between Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers regarding the needed accommodations as well as the lack of knowledge and understanding of how to implement accommodations in the Gen Ed setting.

Behavior- As described by responses from General Education interviews (59%), the sub-committee has identified an area of need to increase teachers understanding and compliance with behavioral strategies and accommodations for students with behavioral concerns. They identified the root cause to be the lack of professional development on behaviorial concerns and accommodations for behavioral concerns.

The sub-committee analyzed the data from internal reviews and determined that IEP timeline compliance has increased from 50% to 71% in the last year. Analysis of the root cause determined that the areas of non-compliance were due to incoming files that already contained compliance deficits. Due to the large number of home-schooled students that enroll, there are many IEP's that were found to be more than 2 years out of compliance. There were also several files reviewed that included data that supported the lack of compliance of more than one cycle on behalf of the sending district.

At the conclusion of the 13-14 SY, 33% of students with IEP (1/3) graduated with their cohort year. The remaining 66% (2/3) are still enrolled with UCA and expecting to graduate this year. Although they did not graduate with their cohort year which affects the graduation rate, the students remained eligible for Special Education services. According to discussions with students, coursework is too fast paced and more time is required for completion. This identifies a potential root cause for why we don't have more students graduating within the cohort.

According to the RDA letter and APR report, UCA has a score of 3 for Drop outs and a drop out percentage of 22.22%. The sub-committee determined that the root cause is lack of monitoring withdrawn students as to whether they have enrolled in other schools as well as as lack of accommodations for students within CA coursework.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 1

Accommodations/Behaviors

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 School year,UCA will increase the implementation and consistency of delivery of accommodations across all courses form 52% to 80% annually as measured by interview and survey data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Surveys conducted 3x yearly to assess consistency of implementation and student/parent satisfaction.

Action Steps: UCA will create an IA (Issue Aware) ticket for each student that requires accommodations/behavior interventions as a communication tool between team members. UCA will also implement a professional development timeline to provide training on the topics of Special Education referral process, eligibility criteria, accommodations and modifications strategies, behavioral concerns and intervention implementation and documentation procedures.

Goal 2

Drop Out Rate

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 school year, UCA will decrease the drop out rate for students grades 9-12 by 5% as measured by the end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Track process of all withdrawing students through DataViews and student's home district.

Action Steps: UCA will implement a monitoring process for students that withdraw to insure and encourage participation in traditional or non-traditional settings for completing graduation requirements as measured by state reporting of drop out rates.

Goal 3

Graduation

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 school year, UCA will increase students graduating with cohort peers by 5% as measured by end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Grades and credits earned.

Action Steps: UCA will increase focus on graduation w/i cohort year by providing additional resources and opportunities for students to engage in transition planning and goal setting during transition classes in order to create a path to graduation as measured by graduation rates in the end of year data.

FAPE in the LRE LEA Person Responsible

FAPE in the LRE Dates for Review

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

FAPE in the LRE Communication Log

FAPE in the LRE Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
12/5/2015 12:15:42 AM	Faculty Professional Development for UPIPS.docx
12/5/2015 12:16:00 AM	Pathway to Graduation Worksheet.xlsx
12/5/2015 12:16:20 AM	UPIPS Surveys Parent.Students November.xlsx

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Disproportionality Program Improvement Plan (2014-2015)

Disproportionality Data Sources	(Hover Titles for Info)	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
☑ APR Indicators 9, 10	• Prevalence Rates	☑	☐	☐	☐
☑ Child count data to review prevalence and categories of disabilities by race/ethnicity	• Categories of Disabilities by Race and Ethnicity	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Disproportionality Strengths
UCA has not been flagged for being at risk for disporportionate representation.

Data Analysis: Disproportionality Needs
N/A

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Disproportionality LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Disproportionality Dates for Review

Disproportionality Communication Log

Disproportionality Evidence Upload

Date	File Name

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Parent Involvement Program Improvement Plan (2014-2015)

Parent Involvement Data Sources	(Hover Titles for Info)	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
☑ APR Indicator 8	**Procedural Safeguards**				
☑ Previous UPIPS Results	• Surrogate Parents	☑	☐	☐	☐
☑ Interview Responses	• Copies to parents	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐ Other (Please Describe Below)	• Written Prior Notice	☑	☐	☐	☐
	• Notice of Meeting	☑	☐	☐	☐
	• Parental Consent	☑	☐	☐	☐
	Communication				
	• Communication in a variety of languages	☑	☐	☐	☐
	• Emergency contact procedures (LRBI)	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Parent Involvement Strengths

The sub-committee; one parent and one sped teacher, analyzed the data of the parent responses, file review and the APR data, they identified 7 areas of strengths.

Procedural Safeguards- In analyzing the parent responses, 95.2% agreed that they had been presented with the Parent's rights and those rights had been explained to them. For Parents that did not attend the Team meetings, copies of the documents and Procedural Safeguards are emailed to parents via a secure server with Read Receipt selected as reported by special education teacher's log notes.

Surrogate parents- According to the parent response, surrogate parents were given all information and Procedural Safeguards.

Copies to Parents- Analysis of the data showed 95.2% of parents acknowledge receipt of signed copies of the IEP/Eligibility according to survey and meeting log notes.

Written Prior Notice- Review of data showed that parents responded at 85.7% that they were informed and provided input into decision for PWN for Eligibility. Parents responded that they were informed and provided PWN with 95.2% for IEP's.

Notice of Meeting - According to responses and internal review, the data support 90.5% of parents were given Notice of Meeting prior to meeting and the meeting was at a mutually agreeable time. In the internal review, Notice of Meeting was evident 71% due to prior IEP and Eligibility meetings held in other districts where files did not contain NOM when received.

Parental Consent- According to the internal review, parental consent was obtained for 100% of evaluation conducted.

Communication in various languages- Utah Connections Academy utilizes forms available on the state website in various languages if needed. UCA also has the availability of translation programs through Google apps to translate in writing documents in a variety of languages.

Emergency Contact procedures (LRBI)- Utah Connections Academy utilizes the LRBI manual provided by the state for all behavioral issues that may present itself with current and future students. This document contains the Emergency Contact form as well as the guidelines.

Data Analysis: Parent Involvement Needs
None identified.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Parent Involvement LEA Person Responsible

Parent Involvement Dates for Review

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Parent Involvement Communication Log

Parent Involvement Evidence Upload

Date   **File Name**

UTAH CONNECTIONS ACADEMY Transition Program Improvement Plan (2014-2015)

Transition Data Sources

☑ APR Indicators 7, 12, 13, 14
☑ Previous UPIPS Results
☑ Interview Responses
☑ TEDI data
☑ Other (Please Describe Below)

(Hover Titles for Info)

	Strength	Need	Priority Area	PD Area
• Graduation	☐	☑	☐	☐
Preschool				
• Part C to Part B transitions	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Utah Preschool Outcomes Data (UPOD)	☐	☐	☐	☐
School-to-Post-School Transition				
• Transition plans by 16th birthday	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Post Secondary Goals	☐	☑	☐	☐
• Age appropriate transition assessments	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Transition Services	☐	☑	☐	☑
• Course of study	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Summary of performance	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Age of Majority	☑	☐	☐	☐
• Notice to Adult Students	☑	☐	☐	☐

Data Analysis: Transition Strengths

While compliing data and reviewing areas, it was decided that the APR indicators 6, 7, and 12 apply to a preschool program. UCA does not have a preschool program currently. In analyzing the data collected and discussion with the stakeholders committee, 7 areas of strength were identified in the area of School-to-Post -School Transition.

Transition Plans by 16th birthday- According to the internal audit, UCA has 100% compliance with completing a transition plan by the student's 16th birthday.

Age Appropriate Transition Assessments - According to the data and interview response, UCA has 100% compliance with age-appropriate transition interviews.

Transition Services- According to the data compiled, UCA has 100% file review compliance with transition services, and 100% acknowledgment by parents and students of the discussions of transition planning and the documents surrounding transition services.

Course of Study- According to the data compiled, UCA has 100% compliance of the description of the course of study needed for graduation. Student respondents understood the requirements for graduation with 91% agreement.

Age of Majority Rights - According to the Internal audit, UCA had 100% compliance with providing students and parents the information regarding the Age of Majority rights during the IEP meeting.

Notice to Adult Students - In analyzing the respondents, UCA determined that only two students were adult at the time of the IEP and both students received all IEP/Elig documents as well as the notice of meeting.

Data Analysis: Transition Needs

In analyzing the APR annual data, Previous UPIPS results and interview responses, the stakeholder sub-committee; sped teacher and student, have identified 2 areas of need in order to increase the number of special education students that graduate and improve alignment with post-secondary goals and IEP goals.

Post Secondary Goals - In analyzing the data from the internal audit, the stakeholder sub-committee has identified an area for professional development regarding the completion of transition planning on the IEP. UCA completed aligning which Transition goals was directly related to an IEP goals with only 67% accuracy. The committee determined the root cause to be lack of training for special education transition teachers in the area of transition planning and IEP goal alignment.

At the conclusion of the 13-14 SY, 33% of students with IEP (1/3) graduated with their cohort year. The remaining 66% (2/3) are still enrolled with UCA and expecting to graduate this year. Although they did not graduate with their cohort year which affects the graduation rate, the students remained eligible for special education services. According to informal on-going discussions with students, course work is too fast-paced and more time is required for completion. This identifies a potential root cause for why UCA doesn't have more students graduating within the cohort.

According to the RDA report, UCA recieved a score of 5 for indicator # 14 Post Secondary Outcomes (Enrollment/Employment). UCA had 0% of students respond to post graduation phone survey (one student in 12-13, 2 students in 13-14). Due to the small "n" size, UCA is looking into

creating our own phone survey and will address as a goal at appropriate time.

Current Program Improvement Plan SMART-C Goals

Goal 1

Post-secondary goals

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: UCA will complete professional development training for special education transition teachers to ensure increasing compliance in the area of coordinating post-secondary transition goals with relation to IEP goals with 100% accuracy as measured by internal/external file review monitoring through UPIPS website.

Progress Monitoring Plan: Internal file review monitoring 3x per 15-16 school year.

Action Steps: UCA will create a timeline for monthly training meetings that includes compliance of special education transition plans. UCA will monitor file review compliance of special education transition plans during the 3x yearly review of files.

Goal 2

Graduation

Resource Category:

SMART-C Goal: During the 15-16 school year, UCA will increase students graduating with cohort peers by 5% as measured by end of year data.

Progress Monitoring Plan: UCA will monitor grades and credits for anticipated graduation.

Action Steps: UCA will increase focus on graduation, w/i cohort year, by providing a Pathway to Graduation program that will target instruction in areas that include: interest inventories, career exploration and planning, life skills and study skills, resume building and college application support.

Transition LEA Person Responsible

Name	Phone	Email	Responsibility

Transition Dates for Review

Transition Communication Log

Transition Evidence Upload

Date	File Name
12/5/2015 12:17:41 AM	Pathway to Graduation Worksheet.xlsx
12/5/2015 12:17:51 AM	Sped Professional Development for UPIPS.docx

Business Plan Exhibit

Does the financial performance of the sponsoring school meet the SCSB's financial performance expectations?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If no, Required Attachments:

Financial Performance Information: In a detailed, yet concise response, address each Financial Performance metric where the school received a "Falls Far Below Standard" or "Does Not Meet Standard."

For the most recent available school year analysis (2015-16), Utah Connections Academy (UCA) met or exceeded each standard, except one.

We met every other standard:
Indicator 1: Near-Term Measures
Unrestricted Days Cash – Exceeds Standard
Current Ratio – Exceeds Standard
Indicator 2: Sustainability Measures
Debt to Asset Ratio – Exceeds Standard
Debt Service Coverage Ratio – Exceeds Standard
Cash Flow – Meets Standard
Total Margin and Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin – Meets Standard
Occupancy Costs – Exceeds Standard

We rated "Does Not Meet" on the Enrollment Variance standard, under Indicator 1. UCA's Enrollment Variance was between 85 – 95 percent in the 2015-16 school year.

With the enrollment cap increase application, if successful, there will be a renewed and focused effort on enrollment through marketing and outreach. With the recent population growth in Utah, UCA anticipates enrollment in virtual schooling options will grow. The enrollment of UCA will grow along with the population of Utah.

Recruitment and outreach activities include the following:

- **Direct mail:** UCA has and will continue to conduct direct mail campaigns. In a typical mailing, a postcard will be sent out inviting parents to attend an Information Session, visit the website, and/or contact the call center. UCA also uses electronic mail to supplement or replace its physical mail campaign.

- **Website:** Families looking for information can visit http://www.connectionsacademy.com/utah-online-school.

- **Telephone/e-mail information service:** UCA has a toll-free information line and an email information service to answer parents' questions.

- **Community and youth services partnerships:** As part of its outreach process, UCA has and will continue to provide information about the school to the community that may include: youth-serving organizations such as Boys and Girls Clubs, parent groups, health-related organizations, and organizations for young actors, dancers, and athletes.

- **Media outreach:** UCA has and will continue to make use of paid media, primarily advertisements in local publications, broadcast announcements, and on the Internet. UCA will also make use of non-paid/earned media, primarily to shape public opinion, raise awareness of the school and share family/school news.

- **Referrals/word of mouth:** As UCA continues to grow, it has seen that an increasing number of families who come to the school will enroll due to positive feedback received from their friends, community members, traditional school leaders and family. UCA anticipates for this to continue.

- **Search Engines and Social Media:** UCA is linked to leading Internet search engines with local reference capability to help Utah families looking for an online school option to find this high-quality school. In addition, UCA will continue to benefit from Facebook, Twitter, and other social media outreach.

In every other category, UCA met or exceeded the standards and the Board believes UCA is a financially viable and secure school.