

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) 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.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

Science standards have existed in Utah since 1985. The standards were updated in 1992 and again in 2003. The standards are articulated by grade-level and aligned to national standards. The state's assessment system, including science standards, had been approved through the U.S. Department of Education's peer review process as of the end of school year 2005-06 (June 30, 2006).

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

Utah currently has a criterion-referenced test in math grades 1 - 6 and in courses Math 7, Pre-Algebra, Algebra and Geometry, with an Intermediate Algebra CRT being piloted in 2007 to become operational in 2008; for 8th grade math, the data reported includes Pre-Algebra, Algebra and Geometry, as students have a variety of courses to choose from.

In English language Arts grades 1 - 11; in Science grades 4 - 8 and in courses Earth Systems Science, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics.

Utah's alternate assessment (UAA) is in place for students with the most severe cognitive difficulties and is aligned to alternate achievement standards for math grades 1 - 12, English language arts grades 1 - 12, and science grades 4 - 12. Utah does not have alternate grade-level achievement standards.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

The State of Utah has in consultation with LEAs set academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). A more comprehensive description of the process was submitted in the 2004-05 CSPR.

Utah plans to begin developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in 2007. A completion date has not yet been determined.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	254505	63.41
American Indian or Alaska Native	4081	57.07
Asian or Pacific Islander	7841	61.26
Black, non-Hispanic	3522	57.72
Hispanic	33766	64.13
White, non-Hispanic	204549	72.62
Students with Disabilities	38862	79.71
Limited English Proficient	26475	69.19
Economically Disadvantaged	90240	70.80
Migrant	1529	69.85
Male	130843	62.96
Female	123662	63.89

Comments: For AYP purposes, the state of Utah administers CRT tests for algebra and geometry in grades 10-12. Most students, however, have taken those courses in junior high so the percentage of population being tested in high school and the pass rates will both be extraordinarily low.

These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Mathematics. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	266900	85.77
American Indian or Alaska Native	4050	75.32
Asian or Pacific Islander	8147	83.32
Black, non-Hispanic	3535	72.16
Hispanic	33870	65.36
White, non-Hispanic	216522	87.49
Students with Disabilities	33578	85.66
Limited English Proficient	26222	81.95
Economically Disadvantaged	92012	85.39
Migrant	1603	86.74
Male	136946	85.29
Female	129954	86.29

Comments: These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Reading/Language Arts. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	35142	72.08
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3720	7.63

Comments: Utah does not have alternate grade-level achievement standards - only alternate achievement standards.

For AYP purposes, the state of Utah administers CRT tests for algebra and geometry in grades 10-12. Most students, however, have taken those courses in junior high so the percentage of population being tested in high school and the pass rates will both be extraordinarily low.

These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Mathematics. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only.

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	29794	76.01
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3784	9.65

Comments: Utah does not have alternate grade-level achievement standards - only alternate achievement standards.

These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Reading/Language Arts. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	40015	75.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	523	53.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1112	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	527	53.30
Hispanic	5338	53.90
White, non-Hispanic	32394	79.60
Students with Disabilities	5902	51.40
Limited English Proficient	4619	53.00
Economically Disadvantaged	15219	64.80
Migrant	254	49.20
Male	20374	75.90
Female	19641	74.50

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	40009	77.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	524	60.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1111	60.00
Black, non-Hispanic	527	61.90
Hispanic	5331	55.30
White, non-Hispanic	32395	81.80
Students with Disabilities	5909	48.20
Limited English Proficient	4611	53.00
Economically Disadvantaged	15214	66.40
Migrant	253	49.40
Male	20376	73.80
Female	19633	81.30

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	39013	76.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	528	56.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1203	75.00
Black, non-Hispanic	541	53.40
Hispanic	5256	55.30
White, non-Hispanic	31359	80.60
Students with Disabilities	5772	49.90
Limited English Proficient	4334	53.00
Economically Disadvantaged	14639	65.80
Migrant	47	29.80
Male	20189	76.00
Female	18824	76.60

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	39017	79.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	528	58.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1202	77.00
Black, non-Hispanic	541	59.90
Hispanic	5255	56.90
White, non-Hispanic	31366	84.30
Students with Disabilities	5775	50.20
Limited English Proficient	4332	52.00
Economically Disadvantaged	14641	68.40
Migrant	47	25.50
Male	20189	77.00
Female	18828	82.60

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	38650	74.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	554	56.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1145	71.00
Black, non-Hispanic	556	52.30
Hispanic	5097	52.70
White, non-Hispanic	31172	79.40
Students with Disabilities	5346	44.60
Limited English Proficient	3992	49.00
Economically Disadvantaged	13808	62.70
Migrant	247	49.40
Male	19735	75.40
Female	18915	74.20

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	38650	78.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	555	58.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1144	74.00
Black, non-Hispanic	557	60.70
Hispanic	5091	55.00
White, non-Hispanic	31177	83.00
Students with Disabilities	5352	42.50
Limited English Proficient	3986	48.00
Economically Disadvantaged	13804	66.30
Migrant	246	50.80
Male	19737	75.00
Female	18913	81.70

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	37546	75.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	553	55.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1105	76.00
Black, non-Hispanic	556	55.80
Hispanic	4960	53.60
White, non-Hispanic	30262	79.90
Students with Disabilities	4897	39.00
Limited English Proficient	3783	51.00
Economically Disadvantaged	13132	63.40
Migrant	259	46.70
Male	19206	75.30
Female	18340	75.70

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	37537	79.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	552	55.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1103	79.00
Black, non-Hispanic	557	65.70
Hispanic	4953	58.20
White, non-Hispanic	30263	84.10
Students with Disabilities	4901	40.10
Limited English Proficient	3779	52.00
Economically Disadvantaged	13115	67.90
Migrant	251	44.60
Male	19205	76.90
Female	18332	82.90

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	36697	76.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	601	54.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1217	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	450	62.70
Hispanic	4516	59.40
White, non-Hispanic	29805	85.10
Students with Disabilities	4035	45.60
Limited English Proficient	3403	56.00
Economically Disadvantaged	12528	70.00
Migrant	150	58.70
Male	18897	79.80
Female	17800	82.30

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	37234	80.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	610	51.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1224	78.00
Black, non-Hispanic	482	63.70
Hispanic	4684	56.20
White, non-Hispanic	30127	84.90
Students with Disabilities	4227	39.10
Limited English Proficient	3463	50.00
Economically Disadvantaged	12884	67.40
Migrant	196	46.90
Male	19185	77.60
Female	18049	74.70

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	36909	74.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	670	51.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1166	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	433	54.30
Hispanic	4437	52.30
White, non-Hispanic	30105	79.70
Students with Disabilities	3748	36.10
Limited English Proficient	3224	49.00
Economically Disadvantaged	11927	63.00
Migrant	163	52.20
Male	18905	74.70
Female	18004	76.10

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	37970	78.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	674	51.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1196	75.00
Black, non-Hispanic	459	62.30
Hispanic	4634	53.40
White, non-Hispanic	30909	83.10
Students with Disabilities	4030	35.50
Limited English Proficient	3350	45.00
Economically Disadvantaged	12407	64.50
Migrant	195	35.90
Male	19464	75.40
Female	18506	72.70

Comments: These numbers have been verified to be accurate.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	25675	44.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1137	28.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	894	35.40
Black, non-Hispanic	459	23.30
Hispanic	4162	26.40
White, non-Hispanic	19452	50.20
Students with Disabilities	3722	33.20
Limited English Proficient	3120	21.50
Economically Disadvantaged	8987	37.30
Migrant	195	19.00
Male	13537	47.20
Female	12138	42.10

Comments: From 2005 to 2006, there was a state-wide decrease in High School tests administered.

These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Mathematics.

For AYP purposes, the state of Utah administers CRT tests for algebra and geometry in grades 10-12. Most students, however, have taken those courses in junior high so the percentage of population being tested in high school and the pass rates will both be extraordinarily low.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	70264	76.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1137	50.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	2249	69.00
Black, non-Hispanic	778	51.90
Hispanic	7129	49.10
White, non-Hispanic	58793	81.40
Students with Disabilities	6311	31.90
Limited English Proficient	4850	39.50
Economically Disadvantaged	17882	61.00
Migrant	324	31.80
Male	35978	73.40
Female	34286	80.50

Comments: From 2005 to 2006, there was a state-wide decrease in High School tests administered.

These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Reading/Language Arts.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1032	904	87.60

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	81	69	85.20

Comments: A large number of charter schools have opened during 2005-2006, dramatically increasing the number of districts in Utah.

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	227	194	85.00

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	47	34	72.30

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Utah is using the following tools and strategies to assist schools in need of improvement with their efforts to raise student achievement:

School Improvement Team: This team has been providing technical assistance to schools and districts, developing the system of support, providing training, and reviewing school improvement plans and providing additional support.

School Support Team (SST): The SST will work with the school in conducting an appraisal, developing the school improvement plan, and monitoring progress throughout implementation of the plan.

Appraisal System: USOE with the assistance of a consulting organization has developed an appraisal tool that focuses on the factors that most powerfully influence school and student success. The major components addressed in the appraisal instrument are: Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, Assessment, Professional Development, Leadership, Parent/Community Involvement, and School Culture/Climate.

Title I School Improvement Plans: Based on the information gathered through the appraisal process, the school with assistance from the SST develops specific improvement goals and identifies research-based strategies that will help achieve improved student achievement. The Title I School Improvement Plan is submitted to the LEA and presented to the local school board.

Title I School Improvement Grants: To assist Title I schools in the improvement process, the USOE provides grants to schools in years 1 and 2 of the program improvement process. Grants for year one assist the school in contracting with its school support team to assist with the appraisal process and planning, implementation of professional development, implementation of instructional efforts designed to improve student achievement, as well as monitoring and providing technical assistance regarding the school improvement plan. Year two grants provide resources to help Title I schools fully implement their school improvement plans, monitor progress, and make revisions as deemed necessary.

EDITED TO ADD:

Utah's number of schools in program improvement dropped from 14 in 2005-06 to 10 in 2006-07, with the 2005-06 assessment results. This is a change of 29 percent.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The Utah State Office of Education has provided funding to Regional Service Centers to hire specialists with expertise in the interpretation and disaggregation of data to assist and train districts in the use of data to evaluate and plan for effective instruction. Training and technical assistance are provided through the Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability, Special Education, Career and Technical Education, and Title I departments in research-based strategies. The following training and technical assistance efforts are available to districts:

- Annual core academies to instruct teachers in the core standards
- Regional training in literacy, data, and decision making
- Regional technical assistance related to ELL achievement

The Title I Department, with the assistance of the Southwest Comprehensive Center, has been developing a new system of support for schools identified as in need of improvement. As that system is piloted, an aligned system will be developed to provide more intense levels of support to local education agencies identified for improvement or corrective action.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	11
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	11
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	82
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	5326
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	84
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	84
Comments: The number of transfer students was based on 2004-05 school year data. The number of schools in program improvement was based on 2005-06 data. The number of schools in program improvement dropped from 14 to 10 during the 2006-07 school year. Therefore, the number of schools from which students transferred during 2005-06 is greater than the number of schools in program improvement for 2006-07.	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	<n
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	953
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	<n
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	81443	67592	84.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2687	2340	87.10
Low-Poverty Schools	2841	2438	85.80
All Elementary Schools	11194	9724	87.00
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	8835	6820	77.20
Low-Poverty Schools	20205	17073	84.50
All Secondary Schools	70249	57868	82.40

Comments: Numbers have been corrected.

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	90.00
b) 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	10.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	65.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	35.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	57.20	23.10
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Lunch Eligibility	
Secondary Schools	48.10	18.20
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Lunch Eligibility	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 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.

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-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	91.50

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The English language proficiency(ELP) standards have been developed and approved by the Utah State Board of Education. Professional Development in sheltered English instruction has been in place to build capacity for the implementation of the ELP standards.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The State of Utah has aligned the English language proficiency standards to state academic content. An assessment and classroom have been developed to align the English language proficiency standards to the content areas.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments
1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>No</u>
2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12; 2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; 3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards; 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)
STATE RESPONSE
<p>The annual assessment of LEP students is being conducting with a new instrument (UALPA) for the 06-07 school year. It addresses the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension at every grade level. Items for the assessment were piloted through the MWAC Consortium. An alignment study will connect the previous ELP assessment instrument to the new UAPLA. The ELP assessment is aligned to the ELP standards for the state of Utah. The alignment study will provide documentation for both the validity and reliability of Utah's ELP assessment.</p>

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	33443	63.60
2. Other	2440	4.60
3. Navajo	1050	2.00
4. Tongan	718	1.40
5. Vietnamese	552	1.10
6. Samoan	465	0.90
7. Chinese (not Mandarin or Cantonese)	387	0.70
8. Russian	318	0.60
9. English	288	0.60
10. Korean	276	0.50
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
6761	5648	32

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

Utah districts with a large ELL enrollment have experienced an increase of French-Creole other than Haitian and Arabic minority language groups.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

The State of Utah has made no changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

The State of Utah has made no significant changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The State of Utah has not made changes to the definition of cohort since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 80.00	# 18336	% 63.00	# 14447	% 21.60	# 5352	% 18.00	# 4462

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	80.00	14447	63.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		8473	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	16.20	4462	18.00
TOTAL		27382	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	46
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	25
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	19
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	33
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	77	81.10
4	177	83.90
5	240	78.90
6	260	76.00
7	192	78.40
8	95	72.50
H.S.	121	65.10

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	86	90.50
4	192	91.00
5	272	89.50
6	298	87.40
7	215	85.00
8	110	79.10
H.S.	81	68.60

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools	
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments: As in year's past, we have no schools which have risen to the level of persistently dangerous, based on our board rule.

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	82.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.20
Black, non-Hispanic	68.20
Hispanic	63.20
White, non-Hispanic	84.80
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	80.20
Female	84.10

Comments: Cohort grad rate = Grads in 2005 / (Grades in 2005 + 12th gr Drops in 2005 + 11th gr Drops in 2004 + 10th gr Drops in 2003 + 9th gr Drops in 2002). Fully disaggregated rates based on SEA tracking of individuals will not be available until the class of 2007. Until then, these are the groups that will be reported, and the formula that will be used. Grouping Asian with Pacific Islander is misleading, so these are also presented separately here: Asian = 81.6, Pacific Islander = 76.2.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	4.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.20
Black, non-Hispanic	8.50
Hispanic	9.30
White, non-Hispanic	3.90
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	5.30
Female	3.90

Comments: Event dropout rate = Grade 9-12 dropouts during 2004-05 school year / Grade 9-12 enrollment at beginning of school year (October 2004). Assumes that transfers in and out during the school year are equal and that their dropout rates are equal. Grouping Asian with Pacific Islander is misleading, so these are also presented separately here: Asian = 4.5, Pacific Islander = 6.0.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

Utah's school year consists of 180 school days. Each LEA's school calendar is approved by their local school board. Each LEA school board has flexibility within the 180 days. YRE (year around school) begin in mid-July. Traditional school begins in late August. Both schedules terminate in mid to late June.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	32	32
LEAs with Subgrants	8	8

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	291	509
1	325	637
2	300	762
3	280	735
4	281	658
5	256	662
6	222	549
7	219	486
8	193	462
9	199	452
10	184	419
11	176	298
12	190	342

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	275	353
Doubled-up	2527	5994
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	100	63
Hotels/Motels	107	235
Unknown	107	326

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	509
1	637
2	762
3	735
4	658
5	662
6	549
7	486
8	462
9	452
10	419
11	298
12	342

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006
<n

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

107

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

<n

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1060
English Language Learners (ELL)	1902
Gifted and Talented	28
Vocational Education	626

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	7
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional)	0
Comments: none	

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	2
Transportation	2
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	2
Other enrollment issues	2
Comments: none	

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
lack of housing	1

Comments: none

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	598	309
Grade 4	Yes	498	269
Grade 5	Yes	517	264
Grade 6	Yes	376	211
Grade 7	Yes	396	219
Grade 8	Yes	328	159
Grade 9	Yes	278	138
Grade 10	Yes	182	81
Grade 11	Yes	164	75
Grade 12	Yes	56	29

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	597	303
Grade 4	Yes	494	268
Grade 5	Yes	517	255
Grade 6	Yes	369	190
Grade 7	Yes	330	163
Grade 8	Yes	416	226
Grade 9	Yes	208	72
Grade 10	Yes	100	25
Grade 11	Yes	73	23
Grade 12	Yes	34	14

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.