

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

## PART II

SCHOOL YEAR 2019-2020

UTAH



The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA)

### **Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202.

## **2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds**

In the tables below, provide the amount of Section 1003 funds of the ESEA allocated to each district and school.

#### **2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs**

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

#### **2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools**

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the ESEA, list the amount of the allocation.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

## 2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

This section collects data on graduation rates and rates of postsecondary enrollment.

### 2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the state's four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the current reporting period.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS150/DG695 and FS151/DG696

State	Student Group	# of Graduates	# of Students in Cohort	Graduation Rate
UTAH	All students	S	49197	88.2
UTAH	American Indian or Alaska Native	S	542	73
UTAH	Asian	S	864	90
UTAH	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	S	808	84
UTAH	Black or African American	S	792	79
UTAH	Hispanic or Latino	S	8918	80.2
UTAH	White	S	36049	90.7
UTAH	Two or more races	S	1224	88
UTAH	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	4934	73.3
UTAH	English Learners	S	2854	73
UTAH	Economically disadvantaged students	S	13410	78.4
UTAH	Children in foster care	S	.	S
UTAH	Children who are homeless	S	.	S

#### Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

What is the adjusted cohort graduation rate? The adjusted cohort graduation rate is described in sections 8101(23) and 8101(25) of the ESEA.

## 2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS160/DG739

## 2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

### 2.3.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I Schoolwide Programs (SWPs) or Targeted Assistance programs (TAS) at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
UTAH	Children with disabilities (IDEA)	31014
UTAH	English learners	32363
UTAH	Homeless students	6138
UTAH	Migrant students	414

### 2.3.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Race Ethnicity	# Students Served
UTAH	American Indian or Alaska Native	4692
UTAH	Asian	3788
UTAH	Black or African American	4605
UTAH	Hispanic or Latino	57439
UTAH	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	4711
UTAH	Total	198490
UTAH	Two or more races	5825
UTAH	White	117430

### 2.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public TAS, Title I SWP, private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS134/DG670

State	Age Grade	Public SWP	Public TAS	Local Neglected	Private	Total
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	7392	366	.	.	7758
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.	.	.	.	0
UTAH	Grade 1	16164	6165	.	.	22329
UTAH	Grade 10	3372	2475	.	.	5847
UTAH	Grade 11	3394	2230	.	.	5624
UTAH	Grade 12	3124	1828	.	.	4952
UTAH	Grade 2	15658	5866	.	.	21524
UTAH	Grade 3	15801	6000	.	.	21801
UTAH	Grade 4	15980	6001	.	.	21981
UTAH	Grade 5	16171	5826	.	.	21997
UTAH	Grade 6	11824	5089	.	.	16913
UTAH	Grade 7	4727	4719	.	.	9446
UTAH	Grade 8	4547	4407	.	.	8954
UTAH	Grade 9	3528	3769	.	.	7297
UTAH	Kindergarten	16153	5914	.	.	22067
UTAH	Total	137835	60655	.	.	198490
UTAH	Ungraded	.	.	.	.	0

## 2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migratory children
- Academic data of eligible migratory students
- Data of migratory children served during the performance period
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of their time while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as “Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten),” only if the child’s residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

### 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, 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 performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls 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 migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the State has taken action to ensure that 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 children 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 term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are “here-to-work” only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a “migratory child” are eligible for the MEP.
- 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 (IDEA). In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children (IDEA), transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Do not count students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution as ungraded; these students are counted as out-of-school youth.)
- c. How is reporting a child “in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State” defined? A State must report a child in only one age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

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 and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

Comments
<p>After working with MSIX and the Child reconciliation count, we feel that there will be very little error in our reporting. We are also aware of incompatibility issues between MAPs and MSIX and are ready to make the needed corrections should this be an issue again. We are confident that our numbers are accurate and have gone through stringent checking that was not available to us previously. We have updated internal protocols to ensure the utmost accuracy and are familiar with some issues that may be caused by human input error from our LEAs. These can and will be remedied should they show up again.</p>

### 2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migratory 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 performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migratory Children</b>
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	57
UTAH	Kindergarten	60
UTAH	Grade 1	64
UTAH	Grade 2	61
UTAH	Grade 3	65
UTAH	Grade 4	74
UTAH	Grade 5	56
UTAH	Grade 6	59
UTAH	Grade 7	59
UTAH	Grade 8	64
UTAH	Grade 9	67
UTAH	Grade 10	50
UTAH	Grade 11	31
UTAH	Grade 12	30
UTAH	Ungraded	6
UTAH	Out of school	16
UTAH	Total	819

### 2.4.1.2 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.

Comments
<p>We believe there will be an increase for two reasons. The first is that we have been able to observe and fix various reporting methods that gave us inaccurate numbers. These were corrected working with MSIX and our Edfacts office. Being able to use the child reconciliation report through MSIX was also a great help. This helped us clarify our actual numbers. The second reason is that we have seen an increase in the need families have of educational support services because of COVID. The inability of many of our migrant students to be on grade level, coupled with the lack of teaching staff support in the "normal" way in which they were given, only exacerbated the issues for our Migrant students. The Migrant Program became an invaluable resource to our families as it became an additional support for online learning as well as supporting families emotionally. The contact made by our recruiters was reassuring in a time when there was much uncertainty and insecurity. Therefore, effectively correcting data errors as well as the need for additional services allowed for our increase in numbers.</p>

### 2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

## 2.4.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory 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 performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance 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 who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer Intersession Term
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	17
UTAH	Kindergarten	23
UTAH	Grade 1	18
UTAH	Grade 2	24
UTAH	Grade 3	23
UTAH	Grade 4	30
UTAH	Grade 5	26
UTAH	Grade 6	18
UTAH	Grade 7	23
UTAH	Grade 8	14
UTAH	Grade 9	17
UTAH	Grade 10	15
UTAH	Grade 11	3
UTAH	Grade 12	.
UTAH	Out of school	1
UTAH	Ungraded	.
UTAH	Total	252

### 2.4.2.1 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.

Comments
For the same reasons mentioned in the previous question, more accurate reporting and the need for services increased our number of participating students in Cat 2. For many, summer was the only time that a student could be at school physically. COVID has had an impact in our student achievement. It has created additional challenges for our families and created new ones that were unforeseeable prior to COVID.

### 2.4.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 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 performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. 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.

Do not include:

- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

## 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

### 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database.

**Comments**

Through MAPs, hard copies of COEs are input and sent to the Utah State Board of Education MEP program director to be reviewed and approved. Only once approved, the data is accepted as part of the Utah Migrant student count. The COEs accuracy is ensured by recruiters as being filled out in the presence of the migrant family, or by phone (during the height of COVID only) so that any errors in data and information are minimized. Child eligibility is both reviewed by the system as well as the state director upon review of the COEs and their approval. This includes checks for graduated students, category 2 students, and children and youth who have COEs. Duplicates are cleared manually when the file C SPR is prepared. The numbers are then verified through the MSIX child reconciliation report. Any issues that come up at that time are then looked at individually and if necessary, contact is made back to the recruiter to ensure the accuracy of the data or the clarification of such as needed. This is also the time when we ensure that the numbers reported are not duplicated counts of students.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every EDFacts data file? Please respond in the table below.

**The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required EDFacts data file.**

Yes

**Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?**

Yes

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

Comments
The Utah State Board of Education uses the Child reconciliation report as well as the student data merge to clear up and ensure the unduplicated number of students in CSPR reporting. These have been extremely helpful in ensuring the accuracy of our data.

Data Quality Comments

### 2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	72
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	72
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	72

<p><b>What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.</b></p>
2019-20

Comments
All interviews have been administered.

**FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:**

a. What are independent prospective re-interviews? Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migratory children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migratory children.

Obtaining Data from Families	Response
How were the re-interviews conducted	Both
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY2018-19.

Comments
The State contacted a third-party, out of state vendor through RFP. The Vendor was supplied with a list of all UT migrant students for the 2019-2020 school year (through stringent secure protocol). The vendor used SPSS to identify a random sample of students to be interviewed from the total list of students. This is how the families were selected to be re-interviewed.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

Comments
No child was found ineligible. We are planning a training on March 31st, 2021 to ensure that recruiters and directors are aware of all interview requirements.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?
Yes

Data Quality Comments

## 2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

### 2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who have been classified as having “Priority for Services.” The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

**FAQ on priority for services:**

Who is classified as having “priority for service?” Migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who 1) are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic standards, or 2) have dropped out of school.

**2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who are also ELs. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	57
UTAH	Kindergarten	60
UTAH	Grade 1	64
UTAH	Grade 2	61
UTAH	Grade 3	65
UTAH	Grade 4	74
UTAH	Grade 5	56
UTAH	Grade 6	59
UTAH	Grade 7	59
UTAH	Grade 8	64
UTAH	Grade 9	67
UTAH	Grade 10	50
UTAH	Grade 11	31
UTAH	Grade 12	30
UTAH	Out of school	16
UTAH	Ungraded	6
UTAH	Total	819

### 2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who are also children with disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	.
UTAH	Kindergarten	.
UTAH	Grade 1	1
UTAH	Grade 2	2
UTAH	Grade 3	.
UTAH	Grade 4	4
UTAH	Grade 5	4
UTAH	Grade 6	.
UTAH	Grade 7	.
UTAH	Grade 8	1
UTAH	Grade 9	4
UTAH	Grade 10	1
UTAH	Grade 11	1
UTAH	Grade 12	1
UTAH	Out of school	3
UTAH	Ungraded	1
UTAH	Total	23

### 2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2020 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>QAD During the Performance Period</b>
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	6
UTAH	Kindergarten	9
UTAH	Grade 1	9
UTAH	Grade 2	6
UTAH	Grade 3	4
UTAH	Grade 4	11
UTAH	Grade 5	6
UTAH	Grade 6	15
UTAH	Grade 7	8
UTAH	Grade 8	12
UTAH	Grade 9	16
UTAH	Grade 10	11
UTAH	Grade 11	6
UTAH	Grade 12	2
UTAH	Out of school	3
UTAH	Ungraded	2
UTAH	Total	126

## 2.4.5 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migratory students.

### 2.4.5.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS032/DG326

State	Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
UTAH	Grade 7	2
UTAH	Grade 8	.
UTAH	Grade 9	1
UTAH	Grade 10	1
UTAH	Grade 11	3
UTAH	Grade 12	3
UTAH	Ungraded	.
UTAH	Total	10

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

How is “dropouts” defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2019-20 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2020-21) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another 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. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2019-20 performance period should not be reported in this item.

### 2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migratory students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period
0

Data Quality Comments

## 2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to migratory children during the performance period.

### FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. “Services” are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migratory child; (2) address a need of a migratory child consistent with the SEA’s comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State’s performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migratory families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migratory children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	57
UTAH	Kindergarten	60
UTAH	Grade 1	64
UTAH	Grade 2	61
UTAH	Grade 3	65
UTAH	Grade 4	74
UTAH	Grade 5	56
UTAH	Grade 6	59
UTAH	Grade 7	59
UTAH	Grade 8	64
UTAH	Grade 9	67
UTAH	Grade 10	50
UTAH	Grade 11	31
UTAH	Grade 12	30
UTAH	Ungraded	6
UTAH	Out of school	16
UTAH	Total	819

### 2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who have been classified as having “priority for services” and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	12
UTAH	Kindergarten	19
UTAH	Grade 1	12
UTAH	Grade 2	15
UTAH	Grade 3	15
UTAH	Grade 4	18
UTAH	Grade 5	11
UTAH	Grade 6	8
UTAH	Grade 7	17
UTAH	Grade 8	11
UTAH	Grade 9	15
UTAH	Grade 10	9
UTAH	Grade 11	5
UTAH	Grade 12	4
UTAH	Ungraded	.
UTAH	Out of school	2
UTAH	Total	173

## 2.4.6.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Section 1304(e)(2–3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

State	Age Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	4
UTAH	Kindergarten	3
UTAH	Grade 1	6
UTAH	Grade 2	5
UTAH	Grade 3	7
UTAH	Grade 4	6
UTAH	Grade 5	10
UTAH	Grade 6	2
UTAH	Grade 7	3
UTAH	Grade 8	4
UTAH	Grade 9	5
UTAH	Grade 10	4
UTAH	Grade 11	3
UTAH	Grade 12	1
UTAH	Ungraded	.
UTAH	Out of school	4
UTAH	Total	67

### FAQ on Continuation of Services:

What is Continuation of Services? The “continuation of services” provision found in Section 1304(e) of the ESEA provides that: (1) a child who ceases to be a migratory child during a school term shall be eligible for services until the end of such term; (2) a child who is no longer a migratory child may continue to receive services for one additional school year, but only if comparable services are not available through other programs; and (3) secondary school students who were eligible for services in secondary school may continue to be served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

### 2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	32
UTAH	Kindergarten	59
UTAH	Grade 1	64
UTAH	Grade 2	60
UTAH	Grade 3	65
UTAH	Grade 4	74
UTAH	Grade 5	55
UTAH	Grade 6	57
UTAH	Grade 7	59
UTAH	Grade 8	64
UTAH	Grade 9	64
UTAH	Grade 10	50
UTAH	Grade 11	30
UTAH	Grade 12	30
UTAH	Ungraded	6
UTAH	Out of school	16
UTAH	Total	785

### 2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of eligible migratory children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	30	30	.
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.	.	.
UTAH	Grade 1	64	64	.
UTAH	Grade 10	50	50	20
UTAH	Grade 11	30	30	11
UTAH	Grade 12	30	29	18
UTAH	Grade 2	60	60	.
UTAH	Grade 3	65	65	.
UTAH	Grade 4	74	74	.
UTAH	Grade 5	55	55	.
UTAH	Grade 6	57	57	.
UTAH	Grade 7	59	59	.
UTAH	Grade 8	64	64	1
UTAH	Grade 9	64	63	20
UTAH	Kindergarten	59	59	.
UTAH	Out of school	16	16	.
UTAH	Total	783	781	71
UTAH	Ungraded	6	6	1

#### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is “high school credit accrual”? MEP-funded instruction, funded in whole or in part by MEP funds, in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. High school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12. NOTE: Children receiving a MEP-funded high school credit accrual service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

## 2.4.6.5 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
UTAH	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	30	1
UTAH	Age Birth through 2	.	.
UTAH	Grade 1	26	6
UTAH	Grade 10	21	2
UTAH	Grade 11	13	4
UTAH	Grade 12	13	4
UTAH	Grade 2	28	1
UTAH	Grade 3	33	3
UTAH	Grade 4	37	3
UTAH	Grade 5	33	3
UTAH	Grade 6	25	2
UTAH	Grade 7	28	1
UTAH	Grade 8	26	3
UTAH	Grade 9	33	3
UTAH	Kindergarten	30	.
UTAH	Out of school	15	.
UTAH	Total	391	36
UTAH	Ungraded	.	.

### FAQs on Support Services:

a. What are support services? These MEP-funded educationally-related services are provided to students. These services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migratory children; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. Activities related to identification and recruitment, parental involvement, professional development, program evaluation, and the one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counsees, or between students and students in MEP peer-to-peer counseling activities, or between students and MEP-funded staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. NOTE: Children who receive a MEP-funded counseling service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

## 2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migratory children in schools during the regular school year.

### 2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migratory children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migratory children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110

State	Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools
UTAH	139	685

### 2.4.7.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in SWPs – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migratory children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110 and FS165/DG514

## **2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK**

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - o Adult Corrections: An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - o At-Risk Programs: Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - o Juvenile Corrections: An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - o Juvenile Detention Facilities: Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - o Neglected Programs: An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - o Other: Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

### **2.5.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1**

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

#### **2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Adult corrections	.	.
Juvenile corrections	5	188
Juvenile detention	.	.
Neglected programs	1	183
Other programs	17	217
Total	.	.

### FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Adult corrections	.
Juvenile corrections	5
Juvenile detention	0
Neglected programs	1
Other programs	17
Total	23

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA) and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS119/DG656

State	# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	Total Long-Term Students Served	95	0	186	0	249
UTAH	Total Unduplicated Students Served	98	0	206	0	319

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	65	0	43	0	70
UTAH	English learner	0	0	13	0	9

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	American Indian or Alaska Native	3	0	8	0	7
UTAH	Asian	0	0	0	0	4
UTAH	Black or African American	4	0	21	0	25
UTAH	Hispanic or Latino	17	0	89	0	75
UTAH	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	3	0	7	0	5
UTAH	Total	98	0	206	0	319
UTAH	Two or more races	1	0	2	0	6
UTAH	White	70	0	79	0	197

Provide the number of students served by gender.

State	Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	Female	57	0	14	0	48
UTAH	Male	41	0	192	0	271
UTAH	Total	98	0	206	0	319

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	10 years old	5	0	0	0	0
UTAH	11 years old	4	0	0	0	0
UTAH	12 years old	6	0	0	0	3
UTAH	13 years old	11	0	0	0	10
UTAH	14 years old	8	0	1	0	20
UTAH	15 years old	10	0	8	0	36
UTAH	16 years old	15	0	38	0	74
UTAH	17 years old	28	0	62	0	95
UTAH	18 years old	0	0	66	0	65
UTAH	19 years old	0	0	23	0	13
UTAH	20 years old	0	0	8	0	3
UTAH	21 years old	0	0	0	0	0
UTAH	3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
UTAH	6 years old	1	0	0	0	0
UTAH	7 years old	1	0	0	0	0
UTAH	8 years old	2	0	0	0	0
UTAH	9 years old	7	0	0	0	0
UTAH	Total	98	0	206	0	319

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

### 2.5.1.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days after Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90–day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS180/DG783 and FS181/DG785

State	Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	Enrolled in local district school	40		79		163

State	Outcomes	Neglected Programs - In Fac	Neglected Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Detention - In Fac	Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Corrections - In Fac
UTAH	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	S			20
UTAH	Obtained high school diploma	S	3			44
UTAH	Obtained employment	S	S			20
UTAH	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S			12
UTAH	Enrolled in a GED program	S	S			S
UTAH	Earned high school course credits	S	54			175
UTAH	Earned a GED	S	S			S

State	Outcomes	Juvenile Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Adult Corrections - In Fac	Adult Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Other Programs - In Fac	Other Programs - 90 Days After Exit
UTAH	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	3			13	3
UTAH	Obtained high school diploma	16			20	19
UTAH	Obtained employment	79			31	70
UTAH	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	22			25	13
UTAH	Enrolled in a GED program	9			S	10
UTAH	Earned high school course credits	44			263	147
UTAH	Earned a GED	3			S	7

## 2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

### 2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	Negative change	S		20		16
UTAH	More than one full grade	4		25		39
UTAH	No Change	S		21		65
UTAH	Up to one full grade	7		23		71
UTAH	Total	13		89		191

### 2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in mathematics pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
UTAH	Negative change	S		20		16
UTAH	More than one full grade	4		25		39
UTAH	No Change	S		21		65
UTAH	Up to one full grade	7		23		71
UTAH	Total	13		89		191

## 2.5.3 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

### 2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	.	.
Juvenile corrections	.	.
Juvenile detention	.	.
Neglected programs	.	.
Other programs	.	.
Total	.	.

#### FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

Data Quality Comments
-----------------------

Utah receives no Subpart 2 funds
----------------------------------

### 2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program or Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	.
Juvenile corrections	.
Juvenile detention	.
Neglected programs	.
Other programs	.
Total	.

Data Quality Comments
Utah receives no Subpart 2 funds

### 2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA), and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS127/DG657

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Provide the number of students served by age.

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

### **2.5.3.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS180/DG782 and FS181/DG784



### **2.5.3.5 Academic Performance – Subpart 2**

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

#### **2.5.3.5.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

#### **FAQ on long-term:**

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

### **2.5.3.5.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in mathematics pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

## 2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)

### 2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the ESEA.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	\$2,586,667
Safe and Healthy Students	\$1,641,538
Effective Use of Technology	\$746,154

Data Quality Comments

### 2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the ESEA. For the “Any” category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below).

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	52
Safe and Healthy Students	33
Effective Use of Technology	22
Any Content Area	.

Data Quality Comments

## 2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)

### 2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate whether the State transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY2019-20?
Yes

Data Quality Comments

### 2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the State that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).
18

Data Quality Comments

### 2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	.
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	.
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	.
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	.
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	.
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	.	16
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	.	2

Data Quality Comments

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2019 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	.
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	.
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	.
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	.
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	.
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	.	\$170,704
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	.	\$11,191

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>

## 2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title V, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

### 2.8.1 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title V, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2019-20 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	2
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	1
Activities authorized under Title III	1
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	1
Parental involvement activities	2

Data Quality Comments

### 2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

**Comments**

There were two eligible LEAs for the RLIS award. The funds were used to supplement their Title I, Title II, Title II and Title IVA awards, along with Parent and Family Engagement Activities. The information was part of their Grant Application Form.

### 2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments
Technical assistance is given in writing the grant application, helping with professional development activities, reviewing and approved reimbursement requests and other issues that arise with the application of the grant award.

### 2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

Comments
Using the information from the US Department of Education and the award letter, information from the REAP spreadsheet giving a preliminary award amount for the RLIS eligible LEAs is used to find the percentage each LEA is awarded on this spreadsheet. That percentage is used to calculate the amount of funds awarded to the state, less the administrative portion.

## 2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	2
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	100

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received.

Data published outside of report

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.7 Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program, Alternative Fund Use Authority (AFUA)

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS131/DG614