

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 2007-08

UTAH



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 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-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Utah State Office of Education

Address:
250 East 500 South, PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Brenda Hales

Telephone: 801-538-7515

Fax: 801-538-7882

e-mail: brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Brenda Hales

Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:56:11 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

New mathematics standards for K-12 were implemented during the 2007-08 school year. Secondary ELA content standards (grades 7-12) were developed in 2006 and implemented in the 2006-07 school year. The state has not made, nor is planning to make, revisions or changes in elementary reading/language arts or K-12 science content standards.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Criterion-referenced tests for mathematics (grades 2-6 and in courses Math 7, Pre-Algebra, Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2) and secondary reading/language arts (Grades 7-11) have been adjusted to reflect curriculum changes. These assessments were implemented 2008 (Secondary ELA) and 2009 (mathematics), with an intermediary transition form for mathematics used in 2008. Academic achievement standards in math and reading/language arts will be set in 2009, in consultation with LEAs.

Alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities have been completed and implementation begun 2009. Development of alternate assessments based on the new alternate achievement standards will begin 2009, for implementation in 2010.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

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

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has criterion-referenced tests in science for each grade-level 4-8 and high school courses in Earth Systems, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. No revisions or changes to these assessments are planned.

Alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities have been completed and implementation begun 2009. Development of alternate assessments based on the new alternate achievement standards will begin 2009, for implementation in 2010.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	258,393	257,516	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,777	3,756	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,264	8,209	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,798	3,773	99.3
Hispanic	37,396	37,160	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	203,973	203,437	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,858	33,662	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28,850	28,678	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	90,536	90,085	99.5
Migratory students			
Male	132,482	132,014	99.6
Female	125,864	125,455	99.7
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,147	45.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,937	44.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,578	10.6
Total	33,662	

Comments:

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	280,866	279,304	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,977	3,949	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,946	8,746	97.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,004	3,915	97.8
Hispanic	39,596	38,893	98.2
White, non-Hispanic	223,065	222,548	99.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,091	34,909	99.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,731	28,817	96.9
Economically disadvantaged students	95,692	94,708	99.0
Migratory students			
Male	143,880	143,067	99.4
Female	136,942	136,193	99.4
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,774	45.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,172	46.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,963	8.5
Total	34,909	
Comments:		

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	359,121	290,868	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,602	4,158	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,597	9,588	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,971	4,056	81.6
Hispanic	48,115	39,739	82.6
White, non-Hispanic	287,495	232,150	80.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43,223	32,768	75.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,039	29,161	85.7
Economically disadvantaged students	111,444	93,821	84.2
Migratory students	1,075	900	83.7
Male	184,598	149,770	81.1
Female	174,523	141,098	80.8
Comments: Percentages are less than 95% because Utah counts, as enrolled, the 9th, 11th, and 12th grades although only a small percentage of 12th grade students take the assessment.			

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

collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,590	41.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,652	47.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,526	10.8
Total	32,768	
Comments:		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	43,494	32,350	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	561	287	51.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,427	1,042	73.0
Black, non-Hispanic	654	342	52.3
Hispanic	6,465	3,406	52.7
White, non-Hispanic	34,387	27,273	79.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,190	3,301	53.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,560	2,810	50.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16,249	10,115	62.2
Migratory students	137	61	44.5
Male	22,327	16,804	75.3
Female	21,167	15,546	73.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	43,499	33,388	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	562	299	53.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,427	1,047	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	653	393	60.2
Hispanic	6,463	3,556	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	34,394	28,093	81.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,206	3,165	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,555	2,891	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,252	10,396	64.0
Migratory students	137	47	34.3
Male	22,324	16,469	73.8
Female	21,175	16,919	79.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Grade 3 students are not tested in science.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,402	32,042	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	589	317	53.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,406	1,065	75.7
Black, non-Hispanic	607	312	51.4
Hispanic	6,278	3,407	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	33,522	26,941	80.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,069	2,979	49.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,253	2,713	51.6
Economically disadvantaged students	15,722	10,047	63.9
Migratory students	158	49	31.0
Male	21,710	16,384	75.5
Female	20,692	15,658	75.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,429	32,874	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	590	309	52.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,407	1,057	75.1
Black, non-Hispanic	608	358	58.9
Hispanic	6,276	3,443	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	33,548	27,707	82.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,062	3,105	51.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,251	2,643	50.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15,726	10,194	64.8
Migratory students	151	60	39.7
Male	21,712	16,118	74.2
Female	20,717	16,756	80.9
Comments: The Limited English Proficient (LEP) numbers are correct. New definitions governing qualified LEP students account for the decrease in proficient students.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	42,602	26,890	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	592	193	32.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,400	769	54.9
Black, non-Hispanic	605	237	39.2
Hispanic	6,269	1,976	31.5
White, non-Hispanic	33,542	23,611	70.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,114	2,437	39.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,255	1,455	27.7
Economically disadvantaged students	15,787	7,293	46.2
Migratory students	156	25	16.0
Male	21,834	14,081	64.5
Female	20,768	12,809	61.7
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	40,723	30,181	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	553	296	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,237	901	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic	603	317	52.6
Hispanic	5,907	3,125	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	32,423	25,542	78.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,582	2,499	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,815	2,394	49.7
Economically disadvantaged students	14,997	9,279	61.9
Migratory students	132	58	43.9
Male	20,666	15,365	74.3
Female	20,057	14,816	73.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	40,744	31,468	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	554	294	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,235	893	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	603	356	59.0
Hispanic	5,903	3,259	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	32,449	26,666	82.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,580	2,415	43.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,813	2,385	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	15,004	9,673	64.5
Migratory students	131	53	40.5
Male	20,679	15,343	74.2
Female	20,065	16,125	80.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	41,088	28,713	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	555	233	42.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,236	731	59.1
Black, non-Hispanic	608	279	45.9
Hispanic	5,920	2,404	40.6
White, non-Hispanic	32,506	24,958	76.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,644	2,512	44.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,861	1,718	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15,118	8,221	54.4
Migratory students	132	44	33.3
Male	20,829	14,962	71.8
Female	20,179	13,751	68.1
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	39,461	29,625	75.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	540	281	52.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,300	959	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	558	296	53.0
Hispanic	5,802	2,978	51.3
White, non-Hispanic	31,261	25,111	80.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,067	2,074	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,503	2,158	47.9
Economically disadvantaged students	14,115	8,669	61.4
Migratory students	138	47	34.1
Male	20,409	15,467	75.8
Female	19,052	14,158	74.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	39,608	31,156	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	542	292	53.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,307	983	75.2
Black, non-Hispanic	556	319	57.4
Hispanic	5,798	3,179	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	31,405	26,383	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,075	2,178	42.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,500	2,219	49.3
Economically disadvantaged students	14,137	9,193	65.0
Migratory students	131	53	40.5
Male	20,481	15,558	76.0
Female	19,127	15,598	81.5
Comments: The Limited English Proficient (LEP) numbers are correct. New definitions governing qualified LEP students account for the decrease in proficient students.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	39,796	27,346	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	538	208	38.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,306	797	61.0
Black, non-Hispanic	555	235	42.3
Hispanic	5,800	2,265	39.1
White, non-Hispanic	31,417	23,729	75.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,110	2,008	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,541	1,563	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	14,172	7,423	52.4
Migratory students	138	36	26.1
Male	20,581	14,621	71.0
Female	19,215	12,725	66.2
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	38,218	32,182	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	531	340	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,209	1,001	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	530	344	64.9
Hispanic	5,236	3,451	65.9
White, non-Hispanic	30,712	27,046	88.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,261	2,245	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,812	2,369	62.1
Economically disadvantaged students	12,278	9,029	73.5
Migratory students	108	66	61.1
Male	19,477	16,296	83.7
Female	18,741	15,886	84.8
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	39,198	30,997	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	543	283	52.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,221	913	74.8
Black, non-Hispanic	572	333	58.2
Hispanic	5,532	3,065	55.4
White, non-Hispanic	31,330	26,403	84.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,481	1,765	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,987	1,895	47.5
Economically disadvantaged students	12,815	8,284	64.6
Migratory students	126	54	42.9
Male	19,994	14,973	74.9
Female	19,204	16,024	83.4
Comments: The Limited English Proficient (LEP) numbers are correct. New definitions governing qualified LEP students account for the decrease in proficient students.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	39,171	26,576	67.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	539	194	36.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,211	708	58.5
Black, non-Hispanic	558	229	41.0
Hispanic	5,488	2,023	36.9
White, non-Hispanic	31,199	23,315	74.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,324	1,417	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,983	1,212	30.4
Economically disadvantaged students	12,788	6,424	50.2
Migratory students	131	39	29.8
Male	19,945	13,596	68.2
Female	19,226	12,980	67.5
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	31,797	24,439	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	489	238	48.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	995	722	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	457	244	53.4
Hispanic	4,245	2,287	53.9
White, non-Hispanic	25,611	20,948	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,071	1,374	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,817	1,340	47.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,993	6,330	63.3
Migratory students	99	56	56.6
Male	16,174	12,385	76.6
Female	15,623	12,054	77.2
Comments: The 2006-07 Asian or Pacific Islander count may have been incorrect.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	38,007	31,765	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	586	345	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,156	957	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	565	373	66.0
Hispanic	5,383	3,412	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	30,317	26,678	88.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,160	1,850	44.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,494	1,883	53.9
Economically disadvantaged students	12,435	8,883	71.4
Migratory students	111	51	45.9
Male	19,497	15,498	79.5
Female	18,510	16,267	87.9
Comments: The Limited English Proficient (LEP) numbers are correct. New definitions governing qualified LEP students account for the decrease in proficient students.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,965	25,719	67.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	577	194	33.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,154	703	60.9
Black, non-Hispanic	549	239	43.5
Hispanic	5,342	1,946	36.4
White, non-Hispanic	30,191	22,536	74.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,027	1,319	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,551	1,004	28.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12,375	6,191	50.0
Migratory students	114	29	25.4
Male	19,437	13,393	68.9
Female	18,528	12,326	66.5
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,651	10,571	48.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	523	177	33.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	705	317	45.0
Black, non-Hispanic	399	146	36.6
Hispanic	3,602	1,101	30.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,422	8,830	53.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,422	1,476	43.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,281	566	24.8
Economically disadvantaged students	7,069	2,891	40.9
Migratory students	119	30	25.2
Male	11,427	5,817	50.9
Female	10,224	4,754	46.5
Comments: For CSPR reporting for SY 2007-08, the USOE revised some processes to align with current EDEN file submission specifications. The above numbers reflect only those students whose assessments counted towards AYP; therefore, the counts of students reflect a significant decrease. High school math assessments that are calculated for AYP are given in grades 10 through 12 in Algebra I and Geometry.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36,682	30,704	83.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	616	379	61.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,212	952	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	468	312	66.7
Hispanic	4,398	2,662	60.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,988	26,399	88.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,345	1,432	42.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,699	1,316	48.8
Economically disadvantaged students	9,193	6,376	69.4
Migratory students	90	41	45.6
Male	18,833	15,145	80.4
Female	17,849	15,559	87.2
Comments: For CSPR reporting for SY 2007-08, the USOE revised some processes to align with current EDEN file submission specifications. The above numbers reflect only those students whose assessments counted towards AYP; therefore, the counts of students reflect a significant decrease. High school reading/language arts assessments that are calculated for AYP are given in grade 10 only.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,286	57,774	64.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,355	462	34.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,280	1,639	50.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,180	470	39.8
Hispanic	10,915	3,724	34.1
White, non-Hispanic	73,264	51,305	70.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,549	2,780	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,965	1,715	24.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,560	11,130	47.2
Migratory students	229	34	14.8
Male	47,117	31,401	66.6
Female	43,169	26,373	61.1
Comments: Counts of high school science assessments will always be higher than mathematics and reading/language arts because science assessments are given to students in all grades (9-12).			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	929	751	80.8
Districts	100	86	86.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	234	197	84.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	212	175	82.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	22	22	100.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
60	48	80.0
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	3
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	3
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

West Middle School and an elementary school not in program improvement were closed by the district and restructured into a new school with a different configuration. The new school, Eagle View Elementary, opened in the fall of 2008-09 with a K-8 grade span. The school district significantly changed staff, including hiring a new principal, and addressed the professional development staff needs during the summer and at the beginning of the current school year to fit the new school configuration. The school district has also improved the working relationship with the Ute Tribal Council to increase student achievement and attendance. Progress in increased attendance and achievement is already being noted from these efforts.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

All districts identified for improvement must complete the district improvement plan and reserve 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development to address the reason(s) for which the LEA was identified in need of improvement. Districts in the first two years of LEA improvement are also strongly encouraged to use the appraisal system described below. For the 2007-2008 school year, the number of LEAs identified in need of improvement was ten. Districts identified for corrective action, that is, those districts that have been identified for improvement for three consecutive years, must use the appraisal system and support teams.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: Because the Utah State Office of Education had not fully developed the system of support for districts identified in need of improvement prior to the beginning of the 2007-08 school year, no district was identified for corrective action during 2007-08. Those districts in need of improvement were given the 2007-08 school year to implement district improvement strategies based on the new district system of support tools developed by USOE.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	5	5
Schools	99	99
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	09/24/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	3,712	4,848
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	1,901	2,357
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	51.2	48.6
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	1,938	2,427
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	52.2	50.1
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	11	
Comments: In 2006-07, Utah tested students in grade 01. In 2007-08, Utah discontinued this practice. Therefore, the number of students enrolled in grades that were assessed decreased by approximately 16% statewide. The Utah State Office of Education does not agree that the total number of students enrolled in grades assessed should be used as the denominator to determine proficiency. The denominator should instead be the number of students tested. Our proficiency rates decreased an average of 5% using the students enrolled vs. students tested, which is a significant difference.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	7
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	4
Comments:	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		11	2	5	A	
2		11	2	5	A	
3		11	2	5	A	
4		11	2	5	A	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p>

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

831.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Bi-annual Title I directors meeting sharing of best practices and strategies to disseminate to schools within their respective LEAs.
2. On-site school visits to observe strategies and best practices as they were being implemented. USOE staff gave feedback and shared those strategies with other schools.
3. School leadership trainings were held with their School Support Teams in attendance. USOE facilitated networking between the schools as they shared their strategies.
4. USOE provided online information and tools to assist schools as they implemented their school improvement plans.
5. USOE conducted intra-agency collaboration meetings with Title I, Curriculum, and Special Education. Each department disseminated the effective strategies with the administrators and teachers with whom they worked.
6. USOE convened a parental involvement networking session with stakeholders from agencies throughout the state. Included in the session were representatives from the Governor's office, Parent Involvement Resource Centers (PIRCs), the Parent/Teacher Association (PTA), USOE departments with responsibilities for increasing parent involvement, and minority organization representatives. Strategies for increasing parent involvement were shared and a networking communication system installed.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

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

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The activities for technical assistance were designed in 2007-08 and will be implemented in 2008-09. Those activities include coaching, instructional audits, and leadership academies.

In partnership with the Southwest Comprehensive Center, the American Institute of Research is assisting the USOE in designing an evaluation. The evaluation will be designed and implemented during the 2008-09 school year.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

K-3 Literacy funds 4-6 Math grant Reading First Title III support funds Title VII support funds Math Core Academy Principal Literacy Academies Safe and Drug free school funds

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	3,452
Applied to transfer	21
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	19

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 23,449
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?*
 An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	2,211
Applied for supplemental educational services	181
Received supplemental educational services	151
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 106,373
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	91,807	72,257	78.7	19,550	21.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	2,940	2,681	91.2	259	8.8
Low-poverty schools	3,363	3,047	90.6	316	9.4
All elementary schools	13,128	11,747	89.5	1,381	10.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	16,558	12,576	76.0	3,982	24.0
Low-poverty schools	19,280	16,636	86.3	2,644	13.7
All secondary schools	78,679	60,510	76.9	18,169	23.1
Comments: Our comprehensive statewide CACTUS teacher credential data base provides the data for this section and we have verified that these numbers are accurate. Teachers working in elementary high-poverty schools were the first to become HQ as new state and federal regulations arose. School districts are ensuring that teachers who are assigned to Title One schools are HQ upon being hired. Our numbers of HQ teachers in high-poverty schools, therefore, will continue to increase in percentage.					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are counted as self-contained classrooms equaling one class and counted one time.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	34.8
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	49.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	29.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	48.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	53.0	19.5
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	
Secondary schools	43.4	18.2
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	52,635
Comments: This number differs from what we first reported due to clarification from US Department of Education of who to count. Our prior understanding was that LEP students could not be counted if they were not assessed on our ELP Assessment. Guidance from US Department of Education has directed us to count all LEP students.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	51,829
Comments: See above explanation. All identified K-12 LEP students receive services in a Title III language instruction program except those who opt out. LEAs are required to serve those who opt out, but those students would not be in an instructional program, so they were not included in this count. This count differs from that reported in EDEN because for some LEP students no native language was reported. These students were not included in EDEN, but were included here.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	41,914
Navajo	1,134
Tongan	860
Vietnamese	803
Samoan	676

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	39,752
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,318
Total	52,070
Comments: The total is less than the count reported for 1.6.2.1 because some students entered monitoring during the school year before the ELP Assessment testing window. These students are included in our LEP counts because they received services for part of the year. We are working to ensure that more of our LEP students are tested in future years. We have been discussing this with LEAs and requiring them to identify why students were not tested and address those reasons. We are also alleviating LEAs some of the burden of scoring the ELP assessment.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	12,019
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	23.1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	39,706
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	11,558
Total	51,264
Comments: See comments for 1.6.3.1.1	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	25,285	57.0
ELP attainment	13,763	19.6
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Utah does not administer assessments in native languages.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: Utah does not administer assessments in native languages.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,545	1,399	6,944
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,170	3,113	74.7	1,057
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,551	3,948	86.8	603
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,177	2,664	51.5	2,513
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	31
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	18
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	28
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	26
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	18
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	14
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	10
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
7,935	7,935	30

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	278
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	35	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	35	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	35	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	35	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	35	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	275
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	7	12
PD provided to principals	4	4
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	4	42
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	4	6
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	28	339

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	04/04/08	279
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2008-09, the Utah State Office of Education shortened the deadline for Title III funding applications by several months. This will decrease the number of days between allocation receipt and the date the funds are available to subgrantees.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	76.7
Hispanic	71.5
White, non-Hispanic	90.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	77.3
Limited English proficient	75.1
Economically disadvantaged	77.4
Migratory students	63.5
Male	86.6
Female	89.9

Comments: The USOE calculated 2006-07 graduation rates using a method that aligns with the AYP workbook. Therefore, some of the data may have a greater than expected variation from last year's data.

Source – Initially populated from EDfacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDfacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.5
Black, non-Hispanic	8.5
Hispanic	10.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6.8
Limited English proficient	8.5
Economically disadvantaged	7.4
Migratory students	15.2
Male	4.9
Female	4.1
Comments: The USOE calculated 2006-07 dropout rates using a new, more accurate method. Therefore, some of the data may have a greater than expected variation.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	32	32
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	40	40
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	333	641
1	372	727
2	338	806
3	342	769
4	322	788
5	266	684
6	243	631
7	169	638
8	178	660
9	111	593
10	125	436
11	139	390
12	150	419
Ungraded	0	0
Total	3,088	8,182
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	289	602
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,574	7,128
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	46	85
Hotels/Motels	179	367
Total	3,088	8,182
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	641
1	727
2	806
3	769
4	788
5	684
6	631
7	638
8	660
9	593
10	436
11	390
12	419
Ungraded	0
Total	8,182
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	423
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,096
Limited English proficient students	2,087
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	8
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
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	7
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	4
Transportation	3
School records	4
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	449	222
4	448	235
5	423	212
6	338	215
7	380	167
8	396	194
High School	716	391
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	447	224
4	452	236
5	432	217
6	398	197
7	376	174
8	378	183
High School	531	252
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	350
K	179
1	195
2	170
3	149
4	166
5	141
6	142
7	140
8	119
9	104
10	117
11	97
12	49
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	27
Total	2,145
Comments: Utah implemented a new migrant data collection process this year. These numbers have changed slightly with the refinement of that process.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although Utah has not yet completed quantitative research to conclude why fewer migrant students are being identified, many conversations and Comprehensive Needs Assessment (C.N.A.) surveys have been done with migrant families and MEP, LEA ID&R recruiters and personnel. That qualitative data have lent substantial insight into reasons for declining migrant student populations. During the summer of 2007, a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.) incursion was conducted in one of the larger migrant employers in Utah. Some of the unforeseen outcomes of that activity were perceived negatively by the migrant population and many formerly or current migrant families. Their willingness to be forthcoming with sensitive personal information (i.e., COE data) to Utah MEP personnel was jeopardized and subsequently fewer migrant families were determined eligible for services.

A secondary reason for declining migrant populations in Utah could be that fewer areas once used for agricultural purposes are available: urban sprawl has eliminated crops and agricultural jobs. Another possible reason for decreases in reported migrant student numbers from last year is that through voluntary statewide MEP re-interviewing activities a few incorrect technical documenting practices were uncovered. Through State MEP ID&R trainings, Utah has decided to operate ID&R practices more cautiously and under more scrutiny. This in turn creates situations where LEA recruiters are spending more time working with existing documentation and families as opposed to searching for new potential MEP candidates.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	196
K	89
1	111
2	89
3	86
4	90
5	74
6	70
7	51
8	39
9	52
10	52
11	42
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,059
Comments: Utah implemented a new data collection process last year. These numbers changed slightly with the refinement of that process.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although Utah has not yet completed quantitative research to conclude why fewer migrant students are being identified, many conversations and Comprehensive Needs Assessment (C.N.A.) surveys have been done with migrant families and MEP, LEA ID&R recruiters and personnel. That qualitative data have lent substantial insight into reasons for declining migrant student populations. During the summer of 2007, a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.) incursion was conducted in one of the larger migrant employers in Utah. Some of the unforeseen outcomes of that activity were perceived negatively by the migrant population and many formerly or current migrant families. Their willingness to be forthcoming with sensitive personal information (i.e., COE data) to Utah MEP personnel was jeopardized and subsequently fewer migrant families were determined eligible for services.

A secondary reason for declining migrant populations in Utah could be that fewer areas once used for agricultural purposes are available: urban sprawl has eliminated crops and agricultural jobs. Another possible reason for decreases in reported migrant student numbers from last year is that through voluntary statewide MEP re-interviewing activities a few incorrect technical documenting practices were uncovered. Through State MEP ID&R trainings, Utah has decided to operate ID&R practices more cautiously and under more scrutiny. This in turn creates situations where LEA recruiters are spending more time working with existing documentation and families as opposed to searching for new potential MEP candidates.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: The system that Utah used for the 2007/2008 school year reporting period is a new system partly developed with 1308(d) consortium dollars from a previous award (2002/2003). The system is called the Migrant Achievement and Performance System (MAPS), www.ertcmaps.com.

2: This system is different from last year; last year Utah used the MIS2000 system.

3: MAPS was used to generate both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah MEP child count data were collected by LEA / MEP recruiters by way of paper copies of Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) through face-to-face interviews. The specific data collected on the COE form are the following: 1) Parent/Guardian data including father mother birth mother's maiden name street address mailing address city/state/zip phone number and home language spoken 2) Eligibility data including why the children moved their relationship to the parent/guardian name of the qualifying worker from where they moved to current destination description of the qualifying work the qualifying arrival date (QAD) and the type of work they intended to obtain which caused them to move and 3) student data, including name and State Student Identification Number (SSID). All students whose data appears on a COE receive an SSID identification number. A Utah MEP specific number will be generated for each migrant student when their data is uploaded into the MSIX National Data System. Also collected are gender, birth date, birth date verification, birth place, and school enrollment date. The recruiter verifies all student data and after review re-interviews any families where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized. The paper COEs are signed by parents/guardians and by the interviewer/recruiter. The COEs are then reviewed by LEA MEP Directors and approved. Once approved, COE data are entered by the LEA into the online MAPS data collection system and become an electronic COE. At this point the SEA MEP Director reviews and approves or declines each COE that has been submitted. Each COE that is declined is returned electronically to the LEA for paper copy re-interview and re-submission of the electronic COE. This is how the current MEP student data system (MAPS) differs from the previously used MIS2000 system. Recruiters collect COE data on a paper copy. Once signed by parent or guardian, recruiter, and district reviewer, the data is entered into the on-line MAPS system and submitted to the state in an electronic version of the COE. The SEA reviews the electronic version of the COE and accepts or declines it based upon the data as it appears on the electronic version of the COE. Dates on the electronic version of the COE correspond with signatures as they appear on the paper copies of the COEs maintained by the LEAs.

This data exchange is ongoing (i.e., every time an eligibility interview occurs and the data from the paper COE is transferred in to the MAPS system). All electronically submitted COEs are reviewed by the SEA on a weekly basis. There are two ultimate deadlines for MAPS student data submission: at the end of May each year and at the end of October of each year.

3: Category 1 and 2 data are collected and maintained through the same set of procedures.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The current MEP student data system (MAPS) differs from the previously used MIS2000 system. Recruiters collect data from face-to-face interviews on a paper copy COE. Once signed by parent or guardian, recruiter, and district reviewer, the data is entered into the on-line MAPS system and submitted to the state in an electronic version of the COE. The SEA reviews the electronic version of the COE and accepts or declines it based upon the data as it appears on the electronic version of the COE. Dates on the electronic version of the COE correspond with signatures as they appear on the paper copies of the COEs maintained by the LEAs.

In the MAPS migrant student data system, before a student's information can be entered a student search is required by way of student name, or SSID number. In the event a duplicate appears it is reviewed and incorrect records are eliminated from the MAPS system.

Because each eligible migrant students' COE is entered with an SSID number, the data are compared with the Utah State Data Warehouse and matched with students in that system. Where duplications arise (i.e., multiple SSID numbers or SSID numbers with multiple names), administration from the Utah State Data Warehouse and Migrant Education review each case individually. In the event that it is determined that there is a duplication, the Data Warehouse performs a merge of the duplicate records. This information is then transferred back into MAPS as the corrected and unduplicated migrant student record.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEA / MEP recruiters begin interviewing potential eligible migrant families on September 1 of every program year. Paper copies of COEs are completed, signed by the parent, reviewed by the recruiter and then signed, passed to the LEA for review and approval signature. At any point through this review process there are inconsistencies or suspect information, the COE is returned to the recruiter for a re-interview of that family. Once the paper copy of the COE is determined to be complete and correct, it is entered into the online MAPS Utah State Migrant Education student data system. At that time, the COE becomes an electronic copy. Any and all signatures that appear on the paper copy of the COE are translated into a date that corresponds with the date that the COE was signed by its reviewer. The electronic version of the COE is reviewed by the SEA in its electronic version where it is either approved or declined. If the electronic COE is approved, the date is entered to demonstrate that it has been signed off. Where the electronic COE is declined, instructions for re-interview are given in the "comments" section of the electronic COE.

No potential migrant student's data may be entered into MAPS until the LEA has obtained a State Student Identification Number (SSID) for that student (including students 0-2, out-of-school youth and ungraded students). At that point of entering data, the data entry staff must do a "system search" in MAPS for the student by name or SSID number.

At the end of May of each program year, all MAPS student data is merged and compared with information in the Utah State Data Warehouse wherein student SSID numbers are compared and any duplications are reviewed and corrected. All students entered into MAPS between September 1 and May 31 of each program year represent those students who are in the MEP during the "Regular Term" or who were resident in Utah for at least 1 day during the eligibility period of September 1 to May 31. Again, the aforementioned process occurs between June 1 and August 31 of the MEP program year. The student information collected between those dates represent the Category 2 counts. In October after each MEP program year a combined merge between MAPS and the Utah State Data Warehouse is done to determine the unduplicated count of eligible migrant students that were resident in Utah for at least 1 day during the eligibility period of September 1 through August 31.

Both the MAPS system and the Utah State Data Warehouse utilize internal formulas that allow for only those eligible migrant students between the ages 3 through 21 to be counted only. Formulas are utilized in both MAPS and the Utah State Data Warehouse to disaggregate last qualifying moves in any manner requested. Because each student whose data have been entered into MAPS have an SSID number, it can be compared and merged with the information in the Utah State Data Warehouse. Therefore, obtaining an unduplicated count of students regarding their grade is non-problematic and easily obtainable.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEA / MEP recruiters begin interviewing potential eligible migrant families on September 1 of every program year. Paper copies of COEs are completed, signed by the parent, reviewed by the recruiter and then signed, passed to the LEA for review and approval signature. At any point through this review process there are inconsistencies or suspect information, the COE is returned to the recruiter for a re-interview of that family. Once the paper copy of the COE is determined to be complete and correct, it is entered into the online MAPS Utah State Migrant Education student data system. At that time, the COE becomes an electronic copy. Any and all signatures that appear on the paper copy of the COE are translated into a date that corresponds with the date that the COE was signed by its reviewer. The electronic version of the COE is reviewed by the SEA in its electronic version where it is either approved or declined. If the electronic COE is approved, the date is entered to demonstrate that it has been signed off. Where the electronic COE is declined, instructions for re-interview are given in the "comments" section of the electronic COE.

No potential migrant student's data may be entered into MAPS until the LEA has obtained a State Student Identification Number (SSID) for that student (including students 0-2, out-of-school youth and ungraded students). At that point of entering data, the data entry staff must do a "system search" in MAPS for the student by name or SSID number.

At the end of May of each program year, all MAPS student data is merged and compared with information in the Utah State Data Warehouse wherein student SSID numbers are compared and any duplications are reviewed and corrected. All students entered into MAPS between September 1 and May 31 of each program year represent those students who are in the MEP during the "Regular Term" or who were resident in Utah for at least 1 day during the eligibility period of September 1 to May 31. Again, the aforementioned process occurs between June 1 and August 31 of the MEP program year. The student information collected between those dates represent the Category 2 counts. In October of each year, a MAPS -Utah State Data Warehouse merge occurs again to obtain a clear Category 1 count. In October after each MEP program year a combined merge between MAPS and the Utah State Data Warehouse is done to determine the unduplicated count of eligible migrant students that were resident in Utah for at least 1 day during the eligibility period of September 1 through August 31.

Both the MAPS system and the Utah State Data Warehouse utilize internal formulas that allow for only those eligible migrant students between the ages 3 through 21 to be counted. Formulas are utilized in both MAPS and the Utah State Data Warehouse to disaggregate last qualifying moves in any manner requested. Because each student whose data have been entered into MAPS have an SSID number, it can be compared and merged with the information in the Utah State Data Warehouse. Therefore, obtaining an unduplicated count of students regarding their grade is non-problematic and easily obtainable.

Utah MEP recruiters attend statewide trainings at least twice yearly, once in the fall and once in the spring. At those trainings, legal requirements for MEP eligibility are reviewed and clarified. The Utah MEP has been using the ID&R curriculum as provided by the MERC, but is in the process of developing a Utah MEP specific ID&R handbook. All copies of current Statute, Regulations and Non-Regulatory Guidance is provided for all participating ID&R outreach workers.

For the past 3 years, the Utah MEP has conducted a complete ID&R Re-Interviewing Initiative. This was conducted by a third party contractor (Educational Research and Training Corporation). Findings from that Re-Interview Initiative are aggregated and reported to all Utah MEP recruiters at the fall ID&R training. Also, disaggregated district findings are shared with the individual districts. Where ID&R findings are substantial or particularly grievous, the SEA schedules a district specific ID&R training for the recruiters in that district.

During the 2007/2008 MEP program year, a Re-interview was completed in the capacity of an evaluation of the findings from the 2006/2007 Reinterview Initiative's findings. Subsequent training was offered on March 9th directed toward priority areas uncovered from the evaluatory Re-Interview. This training also was used for establishing targets and objectives to be evaluated for the 2008/2009 MEP program year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

It is important to note at the onset, that for the 2007/2008 reporting period that Utah did not do a re-interview process as defined from last year's CSPR submission (included below). Utah did a follow-up re-interview to verify that areas of inconsistency and error had been corrected. This process was also used to identify specifically areas of Utah MEP, ID&R practices and procedures need further intensive training. These trainings are scheduled to occur before the end of February, 2009. Last year's re-interview process: A re-interviewing process for Utah was completed by Educational Research & Training Corporation (ERTC) during May and June of 2007. The families of 348 migrant children were re-interviewed within ten school districts throughout the state of Utah. The Utah Sampling Plan for 2005-2006 was based on the following process: 1) setting the Confidence Level and Error Rate: Records indicated that the total population of eligible migrant students in the year 2005-2006 in Utah was 4057 students. Three factors were used to determine the sample size. These included: 1) margin of error, 2) confidence level, and 3) an estimation of the proportion of the sample that would be available for re-interview. The margin of error that was determined by the U.S. Office of Migrant Education as maximum is a plus/minus 5 percent; 2) a sample was drawn from the total population of students 2005-2006. The sample included only those students who still resided in Utah (i.e., at their last known address) of the 4057 students who were eligible in 2005-2006; 3) Sampling with Replacement: In order to achieve a 95 percent confidence level with a plus/minus 5 percent error rate, a random sample of at least 348 students from 2005-2006 was needed; and 4) Interview Protocol: The interview protocol was developed based on recommendations by the Office of Migrant Education (OME) staff.

During the Re-interview, 234 of the 348 students re-interviewed were found to be eligible and 114 were found ineligible. The defect rate for the sample was found to be 33.3% statewide. The defect rate was significantly affected by large numbers of ineligible students in one district (Ogden City). If you remove Ogden from the sample the defect rate for the rest of the districts in the state drops to 7.5% overall.

It was clear from the data that some districts are much more accurate than others in recruiting eligible migrant students (at least in 2005-2006). For those districts that had the highest defect rates the main reason identified for ineligibility was students being re-enrolled in the program that had not made qualifying moves (many students had not moved in many years). Most of these families were settled out and had lived in respective communities as permanent residents. This suggests that recruiters may have been making assumptions about families, or they didn't understand the need to be consistent and meticulous in their certification for eligibility, or they just didn't understand eligibility criteria. There was no evidence suggesting direct fraud.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

A new Certificate of Eligibility (paper copies) is completed each year on every eligible migrant student by family and submitted through the

MAPS system to the SEA (Max Lang) for review and approval. MAPS data is overviewed and a copy file is saved for all student data in the system for each program year at the end of October. No students entered into MAPS after August 31st of each program year are counted in the Regular Term or Summer Unduplicated count for the previous program year's report.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2007/2008 reporting period that Utah did not do a re-interview process as defined from last year's CSPR submission (included below). Utah did a follow-up re-interview to verify that areas of inconsistency and error had been corrected. This process was also used to identify specifically areas of Utah MEP, ID&R practices and procedures need further intensive training. These trainings are scheduled to occur before the end of February, 2009.

Results from the Re-interview conducting during the 2006/2007 school year were shared with each participating school district. Where ineligibility determinations were encountered, districts are required to demonstrate how those students were taken off Migrant Education Program rolls. Also, districts are required to define corrective actions to eliminated future occurrences of similar problems and recruiting mistakes in their individual districts. The SEA will continue to conduct Identification and Recruitment training sessions to define specific areas to be improved and methods and procedures to improve them.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Utah has no concerns at this time.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.