

# Utah

## 2017 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

### Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination<sup>1</sup>

<b>Percentage (%)</b>	<b>Determination</b>
81.25	Meets Requirements

### Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
<b>Results</b>	8	5	62.5
<b>Compliance</b>	14	14	100

### I. Results Component – Data Quality

<b>Data Quality Total Score</b> (completeness + anomalies)	<b>3</b>
--	----------

#### *(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State's 2015 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)*

Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e. outcome data)	2798
Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e. 618 exiting data)	4429
Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%)	63.17
<b>Data Completeness Score<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>1</b>

#### *(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data*

<b>Data Anomalies Score<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------

### II. Results Component – Child Performance

<b>Child Performance Total Score</b> (state comparison + year to year comparison)	<b>2</b>
---	----------

#### *(a) Comparing your State's 2015 Outcomes Data to other State's 2015 Outcomes Data*

<b>Data Comparison Score<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>1</b>
--	----------

#### *(b) Comparing your State's FFY 2015 data to your State's FFY 2014 data*

<b>Performance Change Score<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------

Summary Statement Performance	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS1 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)
<b>FFY 2015</b>	67.45	60.86	70.56	54.04	73.13	62.22
<b>FFY 2014</b>	69.77	58.44	74.17	52.81	74.97	61.18

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2017: Part C."

<sup>2</sup> Please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation.

<sup>3</sup> Please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation.

<sup>4</sup> Please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation.

<sup>5</sup> Please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation.

*2017 Part C Compliance Matrix*

Part C Compliance Indicator <sup>1</sup>	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014	Score
<b>Indicator 1: Timely service provision</b>	99.9	Yes	2
<b>Indicator 7: 45-day timeline</b>	100	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan</b>	100	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 8B: Transition notification</b>	100	N/A	2
<b>Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference</b>	99.1	Yes	2
<b>Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data</b>	100		2
<b>Timely State Complaint Decisions</b>	N/A		N/A
<b>Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions</b>	N/A		N/A
<b>Longstanding Noncompliance</b>			2
<b>Special Conditions</b>	None		
<b>Uncorrected identified noncompliance</b>	None		

<sup>1</sup> The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/13202>

## Appendix A

### I. (a) Data Completeness:

#### The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2015 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2015 IDEA Section 618 data.

A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State's Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2015 in the State's FFY 2015 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

<b>Data Completeness Score</b>	<b>Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data</b>
<b>0</b>	Lower than 34%
<b>1</b>	34% through 64%
<b>2</b>	65% and above

## Appendix B

### I. (b) Data Quality: Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2015 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2011 – FFY 2014 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e<sup>12</sup>. In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2015 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State's data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomalies score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

<b>Outcome A</b>	Positive Social Relationships
<b>Outcome B</b>	Knowledge and Skills
<b>Outcome C</b>	Actions to Meet Needs

<b>Category a</b>	Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
<b>Category b</b>	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
<b>Category c</b>	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
<b>Category d</b>	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
<b>Category e</b>	Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

<b>Outcome\Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>StDev</b>	<b>-1SD</b>	<b>+1SD</b>
<b>Outcome A\Category a</b>	2.77%	6.33%	-3.56%	9.1%
<b>Outcome B \Category a</b>	2.39%	6.44%	-4.05%	8.83%
<b>Outcome C\Category a</b>	2.37%	6.57%	-4.2%	8.94%

<sup>1</sup> Numbers shown as rounded for display purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Values based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters.

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-2SD	+2SD
Outcome A\Category b	20.62%	8.19%	4.25%	36.99%
Outcome A \Category c	18.89%	11.57%	-4.25%	42.02%
Outcome A\Category d	28.21%	8.73%	10.75%	45.66%
Outcome A\Category e	29.52%	15.15%	-0.79%	59.82%
Outcome B\Category b	22.05%	9.03%	3.99%	40.1%
Outcome B\Category c	26.58%	11.51%	3.56%	49.6%
Outcome B\Category d	33.96%	8.14%	17.68%	50.24%
Outcome B\Category e	15.02%	10%	-4.97%	35.02%
Outcome C\Category b	18.43%	7.46%	3.51%	33.34%
Outcome C\Category c	21.17%	11.54%	-1.92%	44.25%
Outcome C\Category d	35.61%	8.89%	17.83%	53.38%
Outcome C\Category e	22.43%	14.78%	-7.13%	52%

Data Anomalies Score	Total Points Received in All Progress Areas
0	0 through 9 points
1	10 through 12 points
2	13 through 15 points

## Data Quality: Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes Data

<b>Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP's Assessed in your State</b>	<b>2798</b>
--	-------------

<b>Outcome A – Positive Social Relationships</b>	<b>Category a</b>	<b>Category b</b>	<b>Category c</b>	<b>Category d</b>	<b>Category e</b>
<b>State Performance</b>	17	632	446	899	804
<b>Performance (%)</b>	0.61	22.59	15.94	32.13	28.73
<b>Scores</b>	1	1	1	1	1

<b>Outcome B – Knowledge and Skills</b>	<b>Category a</b>	<b>Category b</b>	<b>Category c</b>	<b>Category d</b>	<b>Category e</b>
<b>State Performance</b>	14	699	573	1136	376
<b>Performance (%)</b>	0.5	24.98	20.48	40.6	13.44
<b>Scores</b>	1	1	1	1	1

<b>Outcome C – Actions to Meet Needs</b>	<b>Category a</b>	<b>Category b</b>	<b>Category c</b>	<b>Category d</b>	<b>Category e</b>
<b>State Performance</b>	15	579	463	1154	587
<b>Performance (%)</b>	0.54	20.69	16.55	41.24	20.98
<b>Scores</b>	1	1	1	1	1

	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Outcome A</b>	5
<b>Outcome B</b>	5
<b>Outcome C</b>	5
<b>Outcomes A-C</b>	15

<b>Data Anomalies Score</b>	<b>2</b>
-----------------------------	----------

## Appendix C

### II. (a) Comparing Your State's 2015 Outcomes Data to Other States' 2015 Outcome Data

This score represents how your State's FFY 2015 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2015 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement<sup>1</sup>. Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

*Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.*

*Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.*

#### Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2015

Percentiles	Outcome A SS1	Outcome A SS2	Outcome B SS1	Outcome B SS2	Outcome C SS1	Outcome C SS2
<b>10</b>	49.74%	42.9%	53.4%	36.51%	58.28%	45.27%
<b>90</b>	84.89%	69.82%	83.75%	63.24%	84.91%	71.78%

Data Comparison Score	Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2
<b>0</b>	0 through 4 points
<b>1</b>	5 through 8 points
<b>2</b>	9 through 12 points

#### Your State's Summary Statement Performance FFY 2015

Summary Statement (SS)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2
<b>Performance (%)</b>	67.45	60.86	70.56	54.04	73.13	62.22
<b>Points</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1

<b>Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(*)</b>	<b>6</b>
---	----------

<b>Your State's Data Comparison Score</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------

<sup>1</sup> Values based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters.

## Appendix D

### II. (b) Comparing your State’s FFY 2015 data to your State’s FFY 2014 data

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year’s reporting (FFY 2014) is compared to the current year (FFY 2015) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of  $p \leq .05$ . The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12.

#### Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview

The summary statement percentages from the previous year’s reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of  $p \leq .05$ . The statistical test has several steps.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2015 and FFY2014 summary statements.

e.g. C3A FFY2015% - C3A FFY2014% = Difference in proportions

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on<sup>1</sup>

$$\sqrt{\left(\frac{\text{FFY2014}\% \times (1 - \text{FFY2014}\%)}{\text{FFY2014}_N} + \frac{\text{FFY2015}\% \times (1 - \text{FFY2015}\%)}{\text{FFY2015}_N}\right)} = \text{Standard Error of Difference in Proportions}$$

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

Difference in proportions / standard error of the difference in proportions = z score

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the  $p$  value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the  $p$  value is it is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015

1 = No statistically significant change

2 = statistically significant increase from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

Indicator 2 Overall Performance Change Score	Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score
0	Lowest score through 3
1	4 through 7
2	8 through highest

<sup>1</sup>Numbers shown as rounded for display purposes.



Summary Statement/ Child Outcome	FFY 2014 N	FFY 2014 Summary Statement (%)	FFY 2015 N	FFY 2015 Summary Statement (%)	Difference between Percentages (%)	Std Error	z value	p-value	p<=.05	Score 0 = significant decrease 1 = no significant change 2 = significant increase
SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	2008	69.77	1994	67.45	-2.32	0.0147	-1.5817	0.1137	No	1
SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	2358	74.17	2422	70.56	-3.61	0.0129	-2.7934	0.0052	Yes	0
SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	2177	74.97	2211	73.13	-1.84	0.0132	-1.3906	0.1643	No	1
SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	2671	58.44	2798	60.86	2.42	0.0133	1.8238	0.0682	No	1
SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	2670	52.81	2798	54.04	1.23	0.0135	0.9115	0.362	No	1
SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	2671	61.18	2798	62.22	1.04	0.0132	0.7909	0.429	No	1

<b>Total Points Across SS1 and SS2</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------

<b>Your State's Performance Change Score</b>	<b>1</b>
--	----------