

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT
PROGRAMS under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2010-11**

UTAH



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2010-11 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p style="text-align: center;">Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2010-11 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2010-11	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Utah State Office of Education	
Address: 250 East 500 South, PO Box 144200 Salt Lake City, UT 84114	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Michelle Davis	
Telephone: 801-538-7515	
Fax: 801-538-7768	
e-mail: michelle.davis@schools.utah.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Brenda Hales	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"><div>_____</div><div>Tuesday, April 17, 2012, 1:10:11 PM</div></div>	
Signature	Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Utah State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards in Board rule in June 2010. The Board approved an implementation timeline for both mathematics and English language arts that requires full LEA implementation during the 2014-15 school year. The new operational assessments will accompany the standards in the spring of 2015.

Utah is member of consortiums for state assessments for mathematics and language arts, English Language Learners, and alternate achievement assessment. Utah will implement these consortium assessments as they become available and plans no revisions or changes to assessments and achievement standards prior to the implementation.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah is member of consortiums for state assessments for mathematics and language arts, English Language Learners, and alternate achievement assessment. Utah will implement these consortium assessments as they become available and plans no revisions or changes to assessments and achievement standards prior to the implementation.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	100.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	0.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	281,279		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,645		>97
Asian	5,151		>97
Black or African American	4,077		>97
Hispanic or Latino	43,331		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,394		>97
White	217,728		>97
Two or more races	2,953		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38,072		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,211		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	112,706		>97
Migratory students	481		>97
Male	143,701		>97
Female	137,578		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,106	29.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	23,486	62.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,304	8.7
Total	37,896	
Comments:		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	302,644		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,823		>97
Asian	5,619		>97
Black or African American	4,263		>97
Hispanic or Latino	45,594		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,645		>97
White	235,589		>97
Two or more races	3,111		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	40,046		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,800		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	118,553		>97
Migratory students	503		>97
Male	154,603		>97
Female	148,041		>97
Comments:			

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,170	30.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	24,437	61.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,308	8.3
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	39,915	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	241,762		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,849		>97
Asian	4,733		>97
Black or African American	3,451		>97
Hispanic or Latino	36,713		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3,793		>97
White	187,729		>97
Two or more races	2,494		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	30,859		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,552		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	92,873		>97
Migratory students	381		>97
Male	123,461		>97
Female	118,301		>97
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,707	28.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,198	62.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,811	9.2
Total	30,716	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,833	34,702	75.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	524	289	55.2
Asian	808	612	75.7
Black or African American	673	372	55.3
Hispanic or Latino	7,314	3,939	53.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	719	451	62.7
White	35,291	28,668	81.2
Two or more races	504	371	73.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,841	3,512	51.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,746	1,294	34.5
Economically disadvantaged students	19,194	12,369	64.4
Migratory students	74	27	36.5
Male	23,484	17,910	76.3
Female	22,349	16,792	75.1
Comments:			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,864	35,648	77.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	522	316	60.5
Asian	806	632	78.4
Black or African American	672	430	64.0
Hispanic or Latino	7,321	4,410	60.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	721	506	70.2
White	35,317	28,952	82.0
Two or more races	505	402	79.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,847	3,791	55.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,749	1,564	41.7
Economically disadvantaged students	19,211	13,021	67.8
Migratory students	75	35	46.7
Male	23,500	17,533	74.6
Female	22,364	18,115	81.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	18		≥80
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			n<
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			n<
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	13		≥80
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16		≥80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			n<
Economically disadvantaged students	11		≥80
Migratory students			
Male	11		≥80
Female			n<

Comments: Utah does not offer a 3rd grade science test. These small numbers are from 3rd grade students taking an out-of-level test

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,303	35,029	77.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	551	306	55.5
Asian	815	675	82.8
Black or African American	690	355	51.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,968	3,973	57.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	696	468	67.2
White	35,112	28,893	82.3
Two or more races	471	359	76.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,958	3,498	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,253	1,144	35.2
Economically disadvantaged students	18,788	12,495	66.5
Migratory students	79	37	46.8
Male	23,150	17,998	77.7
Female	22,153	17,031	76.9
Comments:			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,328	34,294	75.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	553	278	50.3
Asian	811	619	76.3
Black or African American	688	378	54.9
Hispanic or Latino	6,977	3,920	56.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	697	451	64.7
White	35,129	28,281	80.5
Two or more races	473	367	77.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,961	3,425	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,260	1,062	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18,812	12,174	64.7
Migratory students	80	39	48.8
Male	23,167	16,820	72.6
Female	22,161	17,474	78.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,943	27,795	64.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	477	176	36.9
Asian	800	519	64.9
Black or African American	674	255	37.8
Hispanic or Latino	6,746	2,434	36.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	680	267	39.3
White	33,106	23,840	72.0
Two or more races	460	304	66.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,604	2,688	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,173	482	15.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,719	8,694	49.1
Migratory students	72	15	20.8
Male	21,984	14,609	66.5
Female	20,959	13,186	62.9
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,984	34,247	76.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	572	296	51.7
Asian	857	672	78.4
Black or African American	628	327	52.1
Hispanic or Latino	6,857	3,897	56.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	687	431	62.7
White	34,865	28,238	81.0
Two or more races	518	386	74.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,563	3,019	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,051	1,069	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	18,421	11,993	65.1
Migratory students	86	43	50.0
Male	22,888	17,384	76.0
Female	22,096	16,863	76.3
Comments:			

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,027	34,855	77.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	574	304	53.0
Asian	853	660	77.4
Black or African American	630	367	58.3
Hispanic or Latino	6,862	3,944	57.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	688	449	65.3
White	34,903	28,736	82.3
Two or more races	517	395	76.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,573	3,029	46.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,045	911	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,433	12,132	65.8
Migratory students	86	47	54.7
Male	22,909	16,919	73.9
Female	22,118	17,936	81.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,674	31,661	74.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	503	239	47.5
Asian	840	573	68.2
Black or African American	609	317	52.1
Hispanic or Latino	6,643	3,188	48.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	668	330	49.4
White	32,913	26,650	81.0
Two or more races	498	364	73.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,270	3,001	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,978	697	23.4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,380	10,512	60.5
Migratory students	79	37	46.8
Male	21,741	16,316	75.0
Female	20,933	15,345	73.3
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,019	33,459	76.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	558	297	53.2
Asian	805	628	78.0
Black or African American	663	345	52.0
Hispanic or Latino	6,675	3,684	55.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	697	473	67.9
White	34,155	27,684	81.1
Two or more races	466	348	74.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,144	2,465	40.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,840	891	31.4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,710	11,391	64.3
Migratory students	71	31	43.7
Male	22,552	17,133	76.0
Female	21,467	16,326	76.1
Comments:			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,052	35,532	80.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	559	353	63.1
Asian	797	640	80.3
Black or African American	666	420	63.1
Hispanic or Latino	6,673	4,204	63.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	697	520	74.6
White	34,197	29,021	84.9
Two or more races	463	374	80.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,150	2,956	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,837	1,015	35.8
Economically disadvantaged students	17,720	12,537	70.8
Migratory students	72	33	45.8
Male	22,578	17,638	78.1
Female	21,474	17,894	83.3
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,541	30,994	74.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	494	256	51.8
Asian	787	568	72.2
Black or African American	643	324	50.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,433	3,310	51.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	672	380	56.5
White	32,065	25,838	80.6
Two or more races	447	318	71.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,838	2,581	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,746	660	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,587	10,280	62.0
Migratory students	64	18	28.1
Male	21,285	16,401	77.1
Female	20,256	14,593	72.0
Comments:			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,291	33,727	79.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	552	317	57.4
Asian	811	649	80.0
Black or African American	555	316	56.9
Hispanic or Latino	6,328	3,766	59.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	648	471	72.7
White	32,976	27,884	84.6
Two or more races	421	324	77.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,861	2,270	46.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,391	876	36.6
Economically disadvantaged students	16,313	11,213	68.7
Migratory students	68	38	55.9
Male	21,688	17,188	79.3
Female	20,603	16,539	80.3
Comments:			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,838	35,261	82.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	559	335	59.9
Asian	804	641	79.7
Black or African American	558	357	64.0
Hispanic or Latino	6,464	4,236	65.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	657	488	74.3
White	33,373	28,856	86.5
Two or more races	423	348	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,179	2,335	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,423	840	34.7
Economically disadvantaged students	16,606	11,920	71.8
Migratory students	70	36	51.4
Male	21,984	17,252	78.5
Female	20,854	18,009	86.4
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40,551	29,607	73.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	468	205	43.8
Asian	804	575	71.5
Black or African American	542	254	46.9
Hispanic or Latino	6,265	2,905	46.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	648	354	54.6
White	31,428	25,019	79.6
Two or more races	396	295	74.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,841	1,815	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,372	455	19.2
Economically disadvantaged students	15,642	9,122	58.3
Migratory students	69	21	30.4
Male	20,791	15,153	72.9
Female	19,760	14,454	73.1
Comments:			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36,109	25,102	69.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	447	172	38.5
Asian	714	532	74.5
Black or African American	448	188	42.0
Hispanic or Latino	4,971	2,236	45.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	509	273	53.6
White	28,675	21,468	74.9
Two or more races	345	233	67.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,694	1,224	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,627	329	20.2
Economically disadvantaged students	12,955	7,085	54.7
Migratory students	54	20	37.0
Male	18,090	12,538	69.3
Female	18,019	12,564	69.7
Comments:			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,009	36,846	89.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	541	412	76.2
Asian	784	687	87.6
Black or African American	528	405	76.7
Hispanic or Latino	5,981	4,634	77.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	601	511	85.0
White	32,200	29,865	92.7
Two or more races	374	332	88.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,531	2,657	58.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,946	923	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	15,329	12,603	82.2
Migratory students	63	47	74.6
Male	20,806	18,096	87.0
Female	20,203	18,750	92.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,990	28,350	72.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	494	212	42.9
Asian	770	586	76.1
Black or African American	518	250	48.3
Hispanic or Latino	5,801	2,620	45.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	585	274	46.8
White	30,461	24,145	79.3
Two or more races	361	263	72.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,214	1,473	35.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,920	321	16.7
Economically disadvantaged students	14,504	8,289	57.1
Migratory students	57	24	42.1
Male	19,776	14,623	73.9
Female	19,214	13,727	71.4
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,128	8,631	39.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	422	114	27.0
Asian	334	136	40.7
Black or African American	404	90	22.3
Hispanic or Latino	4,098	959	23.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	429	143	33.3
White	16,217	7,105	43.8
Two or more races	224	84	37.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,835	711	25.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,255	156	12.4
Economically disadvantaged students	8,971	2,829	31.5
Migratory students	48	13	27.1
Male	11,490	4,517	39.3
Female	10,638	4,114	38.7
Comments:			

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,067	33,120	87.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	498	354	71.1
Asian	755	617	81.7
Black or African American	517	341	66.0
Hispanic or Latino	5,216	3,632	69.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	579	430	74.3
White	30,153	27,448	91.0
Two or more races	349	298	85.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,674	1,947	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,495	453	30.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12,197	9,416	77.2
Migratory students	56	29	51.8
Male	19,426	16,403	84.4
Female	18,641	16,717	89.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	34,456	22,731	66.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	401	153	38.2
Asian	722	438	60.7
Black or African American	454	176	38.8
Hispanic or Latino	4,693	1,770	37.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	532	211	39.7
White	27,333	19,776	72.4
Two or more races	321	207	64.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,933	1,048	35.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,311	157	12.0
Economically disadvantaged students	10,710	5,588	52.2
Migratory students	38	10	26.3
Male	17,546	12,013	68.5
Female	16,910	10,718	63.4
Comments: Last year we included multiple high school grades and this year we included 10th grade only.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	981	745	75.9
Districts	118	99	83.9
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	288	209	72.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	224	158	70.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	64	51	79.7
Comments: This data has been checked, and is correct.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
90	73	81.1
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: There were no Utah Title I schools in Corrective Action for 2010-11.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: There were no Utah Title I schools in Restructuring Action for 2010-11.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#)).

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Key Components of the System of Support for LEAs Identified for Improvement:

All districts identified for improvement must complete the district improvement plan and reserve 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development to address the reason(s) for which the LEA was identified in need of improvement. Districts in the first two years of LEA improvement are also strongly encouraged to use the appraisal system described below. There are two districts identified for corrective action in 2011-12, that is, those districts that have been identified for improvement for three consecutive years, must use the appraisal system and support teams.

Appraisal and Support Teams: Those districts identified for corrective action, and others that choose to do so, will engage in a district improvement process as outlined in the following steps:

Step 1: Districts identified for corrective action are notified by the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). After verifying their status, districts are contacted by the USOE staff and asked to participate in the selection of a district consulting team from the USOE approved consulting organizations list. The district consulting teams will be comprised of at least three individuals with expertise in district improvement and in the areas in which the district was identified for improvement (i.e., reading/language arts, math, working with subpopulations).

Step 2: The district consulting team is chosen from the list of USOE-approved consulting organizations and plans the appraisal calendar and tasks within 90 days of district identification for improvement.

Step 3: The district prepares for an appraisal visit by January or February, using the checklist to gather information and helping the team to schedule all data collection events, such as interviews and focus groups.

Step 4: The district consulting team conducts the appraisal in January or February by gathering information from district personnel, external stakeholders such as the Board, parents, community members, and selected school staff, and by collecting documentation. Data are used to provide ratings on the USOE district appraisal rubrics. The rubrics are based on the research on exemplary district practices to support student achievement.

Step 5: The district consulting team prepares the district appraisal report and shares the report with the district leaders, staff, and others determined appropriate jointly with the district.

Step 6: The district uses the information collected to decide whether to maintain, change, or enhance the composition of the district support team to help them to develop their revised district improvement plan.

Step 7: The newly composed district support team works with the district to revise the district improvement plan. The plan is presented to the district board and the completed plan and signature pages are sent electronically to USOE Title I staff by March 31st.

Step 8: The district support team works with the district to implement the improvement plan and monitor progress.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	2
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	2
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	1
Schools	46	46
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	08/08/11
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Activities providing technical assistance include but are not limited to the following: coaching, instructional audits for the neediest schools, and leadership institutes for administrators and coaches of Title I eligible schools, site visits to schools in improvement, and Webinar support on a regular basis.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2010-11 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Utah, through legislation and grants, provides additional school support that includes, but is not limited to, the following funds:

K-3 Literacy funds
Reading First
Title III support funds
Title VII support funds
Common Core Academy
Principals' Literacy Academy
Principals' Mathematics Academy
Coaching Institutes
Highly Impacted Schools
Optional Extended Day Kindergarten
STAR Tutoring program
Trust Land
funds Title II D
Title II A
Migrant Funds for Title I schools
21st Century Community Learning Centers
Safe and Drug free school funds

All of the above funding streams allowed schools, including schools in improvement, receiving those funds to focus on student achievement in a very targeted manner and enhance the learning opportunities for students. These funds supported teachers with professional development, trained parents in tutoring so they could assist their students, and offered additional learning time for students through before and after school programs, summer schools, and optional extended day kindergarten classes. Administrators also received additional professional development through the Principals' Literacy Institute, the Principals' Mathematics Institute, the Principals' Data Institute, or the Title I Principals' Leadership Institute in order to be more effective instructional leaders. As a result of many of these efforts, 6 of the 8 schools identified for improvement in 2010-11 achieved AYP. One school exited improvement status.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	3,908
Applied to transfer	30
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	30
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 19,225

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

3 Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	1,169
Applied for supplemental educational services	0
Received supplemental educational services	0
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 198,910
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	103,008	86,707	84.2	16,301	15.8
All elementary classes	13,583	12,807	94.3	776	5.7
All secondary classes	89,425	73,900	82.6	15,525	17.4

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	35.8
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	16.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	47.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	41.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	21.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	37.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,677	3,498	95.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,002	3,612	90.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,243	10,894	82.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	23,089	20,235	87.6

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	58.1	26.1
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	
Secondary schools	48.0	22.8
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish, Navajo, Ute, Goshute
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>No</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	44,845
Comments: This number differs by (5) students from the data in 1.6.3.1.1.	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	43,942
Comments: This number differs by (5) students from the data in 1.6.3.2.1.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	36,589
Tonga (Tonga Islands)	1,021
Navajo; Navaho	935
Vietnamese	538
Somali	530

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	39,297
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,543
Total	44,840

Comments: Utah's ELL count reflected in section 1.6.2.1 is based on a year-long unduplicated ELL student enrollment. The count of students reflected in section 1.6.3.1.1 (number participating in USOE's LEP assessment- UALPA) is the number of ELL students enrolled during the spring 2011 assessment period. Utah's ELL student population's documented high mobility is a known contributing factor to the difference between the unduplicated yearlong count of ELL students and the count of students identified eligible to be tested in late spring. The discrepancy is within our predicted margins. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's identified ELL population.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	25,356
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	64.4

Comments: One of the reasons the number of proficient students increased could be because the exit criteria requirements were changed from two to one. In school year 2009-10 students had to demonstrate a proficiency of 2B or above on the English Language Art Criterion Reference Test in additions to scoring Fluent on the ELP assessment (UALPA). This year the 2B ELA CRT requirement was eliminated. Another reason could be because the adoption of the WIDA standards required that new standard setting had to be established. Moreover, the proficiency levels and the grade spans were changed.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	38,492
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,445
Total	43,937
Comments: Comments: Utah's ELL count reflected in section 1.6.2.1 is based on a year-long unduplicated ELL student enrollment. The count of students reflected in section 1.6.3.2.1 (number participating in USOE's LEP assessment- UALPA) is the number of ELL students enrolled during the spring 2011 assessment period. Utah's ELL student population's documented high mobility is a known contributing factor to the difference between the unduplicated yearlong count of ELL students and the count of students identified eligible to be tested in late spring. The discrepancy is within our predicted margins. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's identified ELL population.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	9,119

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	3,863	13.2	14,435	37.50
Attained proficiency	24,713	64.2	10,316	26.80
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
English
Comments: Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
English
Comments: Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
English
Comments: Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
4,458	7,839	12,297
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,711	5,934	68.1	2,777
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9,188	7,798	84.9	1,390

Comments:

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,160	4,021	56.2	3,139

Comments:

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	53
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	41
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	51
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	53
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	44
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Consortia members are counted as individual subgrantees in all categories.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,789	317	15

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 317 immigrant students served with 3114(d)(1) funds are non-ELL students. Not all of the LEAs that receive these funds reported students that were both immigrant and non-ELL. Some LEAs had as many as 100+ while others reported as few as one.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	425
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	51

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	39	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	39	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	45	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	15	124
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	14	124
PD provided to principals	39	511
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	35	42
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	3	12
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	4
Total	107	817

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/5/09	7/10/09	27

Comments: Funds are available to Subgrantees 5 days after the State receives the allocation. The number of months \$\$ distribution is 27. From 7/10/2009 to 9/30/2011.

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has shortened the distribution of Title III funds by making them available to Subgrantees 5 days after the State receives the allocation. Funds are distributed as soon as the subgrantees submit a reimbursement request. Funds are available from 7/10/2009 to 9/30/2011.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	78.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	81.2
Hispanic	74.4
White, non-Hispanic	92.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	85.1
Limited English proficient	72.2
Economically disadvantaged	81.3
Migratory students	58.3
Male	87.9
Female	91.1
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	5.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4.2
Limited English proficient	5.7
Economically disadvantaged	4.1
Migratory students	4.4
Male	2.9
Female	2.3
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	31	31
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	41	41
Comments:		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	51	23
K	1,053	779
1	1,230	877
2	1,291	995
3	1,329	964
4	594	897
5	1,226	928
6	1,150	837
7	919	675
8	927	720
9	864	696
10	808	658
11	708	575
12	697	577
Ungraded	0	0
Total	12,847	10,201
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	674	579
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	11,222	8,929
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	594	457
Hotels/Motels	357	236
Total	12,847	10,201
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	11
1	N<
2	11
3	17
4	N<
5	12
6	10
7	25
8	36
9	30
10	48
11	65
12	172
Ungraded	
Total	453
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	453
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	91
Limited English proficient students	48
Comments:	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,305	783
4	1,194	683
5	1,198	657
6	1,103	694
7	927	569
8	871	667
High School	677	451
Comments:		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,303	719
4	1,191	718
5	1,198	675
6	1,101	606
7	902	553
8	742	331
High School	564	133
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	179
K	115
1	130
2	109
3	106
4	110
5	101
6	88
7	84
8	78
9	74
10	61
11	65
12	51
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	19
Total	1,370

Comments: There were no students identified as "Ungraded" during the 2010/2011 program year.

To ensure that we only report unduplicated students, we have a number of processes and checks in place. These are outlined below.

- LEAs identify students in MAPS by their SSID (State Student Identifier) number when entering COE and other data. If the student is new to the LEA, the LEA personnel first check to see if the student is already in the SSID system before assigning a new one.

- The data is extracted from MAPS and sent the SEA in preparation for the CSPR. This data is manually checked for duplicate names and correct SSIDs. If there are any questions about a student record, the SEA requests clarification from the LEA. As Utah has a small population of migrant students, manual checks are not too cumbersome to undertake efficiently.

- The SEA Data Quality staff recheck the data, again ensuring that the SSIDs are correct and that there are no duplicate entries. UTREX (our SLDS system) also tracks duplicate SSIDs. If there is a question about a student SSID, the LEAs are required to resolve the issue.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Continued proposed immigration bills coupled with lack of federal immigration policy have created continued negative outcomes in the migrant population. Their willingness to be forthcoming with sensitive personal information (i.e., National COE data) to Utah MEP personnel has been jeopardized. Recognizing this from last year's drastic decrease in numbers LEA ID&R recruiters have increased their efforts in order to build trust in our migrant communities. They are beginning to overcome the mistrust that has recently existed and have, therefore, contacted more eligible families.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	86
K	58
1	68
2	56
3	56
4	52
5	56
6	47
7	39
8	15
9	18
10	11
11	N<
12	N<
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<
Total	574

Comments: There were no students identified as "Ungraded" for the 2010/2011 program year.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Continued proposed immigration bills coupled with lack of federal immigration policy have created continued negative outcomes in the migrant population. Their willingness to be forthcoming with sensitive personal information (i.e., National COE data) to Utah MEP personnel has been jeopardized. Recognizing this from last year's drastic decrease in numbers LEA ID&R recruiters have increased their efforts in order to build trust in our migrant communities. They are beginning to overcome the mistrust that has recently existed and have, therefore, contacted more eligible families.

Also, as the Utah MEP continues to review and revise its Comprehensive Needs Assessment and subsequent Service Delivery Plan, LEAs change the times and methods they use to more efficiently and effectively provide instructional services to migrant students. This program year, LEA MEPs provided more services during the summer intersession and therefore more students were identified for this data field.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 1: The system that Utah used for the 2010/2011 school year reporting period is the Migrant Achievement and Performance System (MAPS), www.ertcmaps.com.
- 2: The child counts for the last reporting period were generated using MAPS.
- 3: MAPS was used to generate both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: Utah MEP child count data were collected by LOA/MEP recruiters by way of paper copies of National Certificates of Eligibility (COEs). All interviews are conducted face to face. The data elements collected through the National COE are as follows: The School District, Program Year, Male Guardian's Name, Female Guardian's Name, Current Address, Student's Unique Migrant State Student Identification Number, Student's Name, Student's Sex, Student's Birth Date, Birth Date Verification Code, Residency Date, Grade, School Building Number, Qualifying Work Information (i.e., moved from, QAD, type of qualifying work, verification of temporary work), Guardian Signature, Signature of Interviewer, Signature of Designated LOA Reviewer, Signature of Designated SEA Reviewer. The National COEs are signed by parents/guardians and by the interviewer/recruiter. The COEs are then reviewed by LOA/ MEP Directors and approved. Once approved, COE data are entered by the LOA into the online MAPS data collection system, at which point the SEA/MEP Director reviews and approves or declines each COE that has been submitted. Each COE that is declined is returned electronically to the LEA for re-interview and re-submission of a new and corrected COE for SEA review and approval or decline.

2: Districts submit with every student on every National COE a State Student Identification Number (SSID) so that data submitted through MAPS (i.e., demographic data, MEP eligibility data, school enrollment, etc.) can align with student enrollment data submitted to the Utah Data Warehouse. The SSID number allows the SEA to match students with the Utah State Data Warehouse data and complete student records with any other data not collected through MAPS (e.g., immunization records, state assessment data, ELA acquisition data, class schedules, etc.). This data exchange occurs continuously. MAPS data are exchanged with MSIX monthly.

3: Category 1 and 2 data are collected and maintained through the same set of procedures. For all eligible migrant students, data is reported by the LOA individually for each student in the MAPS system. A field labeled, "Student Data" requires the LOA to select from a drop down box the following enrollment options: Regular Term, Summer/Intercession, Year Round, Residency Only. Only one enrollment type may be selected and each student's enrollment is tied to his/her SSID number and can only be counted and reported once. A second check box requires LOAs to check if each student received services during the Category 1 Regular Term, the Category 2 Summer Term, or Both. Again, the data is reported for each eligible migrant student individually and is tied to his/her unique SSID number. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of September of each year. Once again, the enrollment boxes and services provided boxes in MAPS are reviewed and updated at the end of each program year by the LOA to include data specifically regarding participation in a Summer/Intercession program. This data is reported throughout the program year, but reviewed by the LOA and ultimately the SEA at the end of the program year for every student.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data are entered into the online MAPS system by LOA/MEP staff after the paper copies of National COEs have been submitted to LOA/MEP Directors for approval. LOA/MEP personnel input the student data and update changes in the MAPS system as needed. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of May (regular school year) each year and before the end of September of each year. The MAPS system automatically organizes this information disaggregated by district as well as aggregated for the whole state MEP.

A unique SSID number is created for all eligible migrant students in Utah ages 3 - 21. This number is entered by LOA/MEP staff into the MAPS/MEP system. Every student's SSID number is also reported by the LOA into the State Data Warehouse for general school enrollment purposes. At the end of each MEP program year, SSID numbers from MAPS and corresponding data are coordinated with SSID numbers and data from the Utah Data Warehouse. These data are combined into a master Migrant Education file for review. Where duplicate names, similar names, or suspect data exist in the file, corresponding COEs are retrieved from MAPS and electronically returned to its LOA of origin for clarification. Once clarification regarding any possible duplication has occurred, then duplicate records are eliminated from the master Migrant Education data file as well as from MAPS and the Utah Data Warehouse.

At the end of each program year and after data review between the Utah Data Warehouse and MAPS, all COEs in the MAPS system are moved within the system under the to the "Needs Updated" file. For the upcoming program year, each COE in

the "Needs Updated" file must be reviewed, updated, and resubmitted to the SEA for approval. It is the Utah MEP practice to re-interview each family each program year to ensure the students' continued eligibility in the program. Students who have been found to be ineligible through re-interview have their COE moved from the "Needs Updated" file in MAPS to the "COE Withdrawn" file. This process is the same for both Category I and Category II counts.

If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each child in the count is taken directly from the approved National COEs. Furthermore, the MAPS system automatically calculates (using the QAD) the exact number of students that were eligible within the last three years. Also using the QAD, the MAPS system calculates all students who were residents for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 to August 31st). The qualifying activity for each child's family is included on the approved National COE (which is maintained in the Utah MAPS system electronically). LEAs/LOAs are required to enter on the electronic National COE each child age. LEAs/LOAs are also required to input into the MAPS system (for each child) any and all MEP services provided during summer, regular year, or intersession. LOAs are also required to input each student's current grade level in relation to each child count category. The MAPS system maintains all of this data and creates an end of year report including each of these topics.

Child count data are entered into the online MAPS system by LOA/MEP staff after the paper copies of National COEs have been submitted to LOA/MEP Directors for approval. LOA/MEP personnel input the student data and update changes in the MAPS system as needed. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of May (regular school year) each year and before the end of October (Summer Program, unduplicated count) each year. The MAPS system automatically organizes this information disaggregated by district as well as aggregated for the whole state MEP. Each eligible migrant student whose information has been entered into MAPS.

A unique SSID number is created for all eligible migrant students in Utah ages 3 - 21. This number is entered by LOA/MEP staff into the MAPS/MEP system. Every student's SSID number is also reported by the LOA into the State Data Warehouse for general school enrollment purposes. At the end of each MEP program year, SSID numbers from MAPS and corresponding data are coordinated with SSID numbers and data from the Utah Data Warehouse. These data are combined into a master Migrant Education file for review. Where duplicate names, or similar names exist in the file, corresponding COEs are retrieved from MAPS and electronically returned to its LOA of origin for clarification. Once clarification regarding any possible duplication has occurred, then duplicate records are eliminated from the master Migrant Education data file as well as from MAPS and the Utah Data Warehouse.

If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 and Category 2 child count data are first collected by LOA Identification and Recruitment (ID&R)recruiters in the form of paper-based National Certificates of Eligibility (COE). All interviews are conducted face to face. The specific data collected on the COE form are the following: 1) Parent/Guardian data including father, mother, birth mother's maiden name, street address, mailing address, city/state/zip, phone number and home language spoken, 2) Eligibility data including why the children moved, their relationship to the parent/guardian, name of the qualifying worker, from where they moved, a description of the qualifying work, the qualifying arrival data (QAD) and the type of work they intended to obtain which caused them to move, and 3) student data including name, MAPS and SSID identification number, gender, birth date, birth date verification, birth place, and school enrollment date. The Recruiter verifies all student data and after review reinterviews any families where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized. The ID&R recruiter submits the National COE to the LOA Director for review and approval. Again, where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized the family in question is reinterviewed and a new National COE is completed. At this point, all National COEs and any addition MEP pertinent data is entered into the MAPS system.

The SEA conducts at least one state wide ID&R training annually for Migrant Education recruiters and data entry personnel. The focus of these trainings are results from the Prospective Re-Interview and data entry for the MAPS data system. Eligibility training is based on the Non Regulatory Guidance, the National ID&R Curriculum and the Utah Migrant Education Recruiter's Manual. MAPS data entry training is based on the MAPS User's Guide. All training materials are available on the Utah State Office of Education Website. Additional and ongoing training on flexible ID&R and data entry topics is available through webinar and LOA onsite trainings. Every program year all LOAs must complete the online desktop monitoring instrument (TRACKER). As part of the desktop monitoring, multiple samples of current paper-copy COEs must be scanned into the system for review by the SEA. Every other year, each LOA must participate in an onsite monitoring visit conducted by the SEA. Again, multiple samples of the current program's COEs are provided and reviewed for consistency and accuracy.

All LOAs' approved National COEs are submitted to the SEA through the online MAPS system. The SEA reviews and approves each National COE. Initial SEA approval is done by Renée Medina, Migrant Ed. data specialist, and final signed/dated approval is done by Max Lang, State Migrant Education Director. Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review, they are sent back electronically through MAPS to the district for re-interview. Re-interviewed COEs must be submitted to the SEA before the end of September for all Unduplicated student counts. All migrant student data from National COEs, both Regular term and Summer Intersession, that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian, district recruiter, District Director, and approved by the SEA are entered into the MAPS system no later than September 30 of each year. Because the MAPS system matches SSID numbers from district submission for the MEP and from the State Data Warehouse, duplications are easily discovered and sent back to the LEA for verification and correction.

Category 1 and 2 data are collected and maintained through the same set of procedures. All data are reviewed by the SEA Migrant Education Director in Coordination with the Data Warehouse personnel and the EDEN Administration. For all eligible migrant students, data is reported by the LOA individually for each student in the MAPS system. A field labeled, "Student Data" requires the LOA to select from a drop down box the following enrollment options: Regular Term, Summer/Intersession, Year Round, Residency Only. Only one enrollment type may be selected and each student's enrollment is tied to his/her SSID number and can only be counted and reported once. A second check box requires LOAs to check if each student received services during the Category 1 Regular Term, the Category 2 Summer Term, or Both. Again, the data is reported for each eligible migrant student individually and is tied to his/her unique SSID number. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of September for each year. Once again, the enrollment boxes and services provided boxes in MAPS are reviewed and updated at the end of each program year by the LOA to include data specifically regarding participation in a Summer/Intersession program. This data is reported throughout the program year, but reviewed by the LOA and ultimately the SEA at the end of the program year for every student.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2010/2011 program year, the Utah MEP conducted a Prospective Re-interview following the protocol as instructed in the Federal Regulations SEC. 200.89(b)(2).

A random sample of students was identified from each Utah migrant program districts using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The sampling was designed to ensure that at least twenty students were identified from each of the Utah migrant districts to ensure that a minimum of six different families were re-interviewed from each of the 14 Utah local migrant programs. After discussion with

the state director and the districts it was estimated that in order to identify any problems or issues with identification and recruitment in a district a minimum of six families needed to be re-interviewed in each program. Twenty families were randomly selected from each district as an oversample based on the assumption that the auditor would have a 50% contact rate in order to successfully contact six families per

district. This percentage is based on previous years contact rate in Utah with re-interview process by ERTC. It was also understood that in some of the smallest local programs the auditor may not be able to successfully find six families. In which

case the interviewer was given all the COEs from those districts and required to contact each family a minimum of three times. As a result in some circumstances there were less than six families interviewed in the smallest districts. There were also a few districts which had yet to receive approval for any COEs in 2010-2011, these districts had zero contacts. The interviewer from Educational Research and Training Corporation (ERTC) was then asked to construct an interviewing schedule using

the sample. The interviewer (Ms. Hilda Lloyd) was provided copies of the COEs from the sample and contact names in each district by the state migrant director to assist them in locating families of students within the sample. The interviewing schedule was discussed with the project coordinator as well as the state migrant director. The re-interviewing process began in April 2010 and was completed by May, 2010.

In its most direct form, the analysis for this project is fairly straight forward. The interviewer indicated on the interview protocol any possible questions regarding the accuracy of the recruiter and any questions regarding student eligibility. The interviewer used the OME Non-Regulatory Guidance from 2010 to ascertain student eligibility depending on the date of initial qualification. The project coordinator then reviewed all the results of the written interview protocols in relation to the original Certificates of Eligibility from 2010-2011. The project coordinator then supported or contested the audit interviewer's assessment. Finally, the Utah State Migrant Director reviewed the forms and the findings so that an agreement by three distinct reviewers facilitated the validity of the process. In addition, each of the reviewers was asked to identify any other issues (e.g. intentional fraud, high defect rates from certain recruiters, etc.) that were of importance to note and help to further clarify recruitment identification and eligibility issues for the state of Utah. A record of each interview protocol, the independent judgments and comments of each reviewer (i.e., audit interviewers, project coordinator, and state director) is available and will be maintained for review at the Utah Department of Education. There were no discrepancies found during the review process (i.e. the audit interviewer, the project coordinator, and the state migrant director all agreed on recruitment issues).

The Utah audit assessment of recruiter effectiveness was completed over the agreed upon contract period by Educational Research and Training Corporation. It was clear that there were fewer issues in 2010-2011 in recruiting than in previous years that need to be addressed as part of a training program for local district recruiters. A few of the most common recruiter errors were: qualifying person on COE conflict--different name on COE; students being re-enrolled in the program that had not made qualifying moves, families doing nonqualifying work, out of date qualifying arrival dates, and families that were settled out and had lived in respective communities as permanent residents. Most of the mistakes made by recruiters on the COEs did not result in the ineligibility of the students in those families.

Of the thirty-eight students from twenty-six families interviewed in the sample four were ineligible for services (10.5%).

Based on the results of the audit the contractors recommend the following:

1. The immediate removal of any ineligible students identified in the audit still listed as active migrant students
2. A regular audit process (e.g. annually) of current Utah Migrant Programs to identify issues and correct problems quickly;
3. Require all districts receiving migrant funds to continue to attend a rigorous recruiter training program based on the issues identified in this assessment.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Utah MAPS system allows for constant quality management. The SEA, MEP staff checks each LOA's COE and migrant student data submission each Friday of the week during the entire duration of the program year. Any inaccuracies or problems are immediately

corrected by correspondence with LOA/MEP staff.

At the end of May of each year and again at the end of October of each year, MAPS and student data from the State Data Warehouse are uploaded and merged by way of matching SSID numbers and intense scrutiny of mismatches or inconsistencies of information from those data merges. MAPS data are uploaded to MSIX monthly.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All LEA/LOA approved National COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and approves through MAPS each COE. Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review, they are sent back to the district for re-interview. All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian, LOA ID&R recruiter, LOA Director, and SEA are entered into the MAPS system no later than the end of September of each year. At the time of data merge from the MAPS system and the State Data Warehouse, any inconsistent and/or suspect data, or duplication identified and corrected by the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family.

A unique SSID number is created for all eligible migrant students in Utah ages 3 - 21. This number is entered by LOA/MEP staff into the MAPS/MEP system. Every student's SSID number is also reported by the LOA into the State Data Warehouse for general school enrollment purposes. At the end of each MEP program year, SSID numbers from MAPS and corresponding data are coordinated with SSID numbers and data from the Utah Data Warehouse. These data are combined into a master Migrant Education file for review by the SEA. Where duplicate names, or similar names exist in the file, corresponding COEs are retrieved from MAPS and electronically returned to its LOA of origin for clarification. Once clarification regarding any possible duplication has occurred, then duplicate records are eliminated from the master Migrant Education data file as well as from MAPS and the Utah Data Warehouse.

The National Certificate of Eligibility (paper copies) is completed each year on every eligible migrant student by family and submitted through the MAPS system to the SEA (Max Lang) for review and approval. MAPS data is over viewed and a copy file is saved for all student data in the system for each program year at the end of October. No students entered into MAPS after August 31st of each program year are counted in the Regular Term or Summer Unduplicated count for the previous program year's report. All MAPS data are uploaded to MSIX monthly

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Results from the 2010/2011 Prospective Re-interview conducting during the were shared with each participating LOA in a unique report and in conjunction with a Utah State MEP,LOA Directors' meeting.

Where ineligibility determinations were encountered, LOAs are required to demonstrate how those students were taken off Migrant Education Program rolls. Also, LOAs are required to define corrective actions to eliminated future occurrences of similar problems and recruiting mistakes in their individual LOAs . The SEA conducts at least one state wide ID&R training annually for Migrant Education recruiters and data entry personnel. The focus of these trainings are results from the Prospective Re-Interview and data entry for the MAPS data system. Eligibility training is based on the Non Regulatory Guidance, the National ID&R Curriculum and the Utah Migrant Education Recruiter's Manual. MAPS data entry training is based on the MAPS User's Guide. All training materials are available on the Utah State Office of Education Website. Additional and ongoing training on flexible ID&R and data entry topics is available through webinar and LOA onsite trainings.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has no concerns at this time.