

# **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 ED Facts 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-HLP-EDEN (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 X 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](mailto:brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov)

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

Brenda Hales

Tuesday, May 5, 2009, 5:11:07 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009  
5PM EST**

## 2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

### 2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's NCLB assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

#### 2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	11,176	7,619	68.2
4	10,684	7,433	69.6
5	9,976	6,789	68.1
6	6,877	4,510	65.6
7	1,648	1,143	69.4
8	1,539	848	55.1
High School	230	64	27.8
Total	42,130	28,406	67.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

#### 2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	11,187	7,745	69.2
4	10,694	7,429	69.5
5	9,985	6,981	69.9
6	6,898	4,748	68.8
7	1,786	1,036	58.0
8	1,794	1,173	65.4
High School	345	216	62.6
Total	42,689	29,328	68.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b) (3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	3,349	2,648	79.1
4	3,246	2,630	81.0
5	2,801	2,206	78.8
6	1,840	1,408	76.5
7	532	465	87.4
8	326	247	75.8
High School	299	162	54.2
Total	12,393	9,766	78.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	3,346	2,696	80.6
4	3,241	2,656	82.0
5	2,792	2,279	81.6
6	1,838	1,458	79.3
7	549	435	79.2
8	417	344	82.5
High School	509	443	87.0
Total	12,692	10,311	81.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

## 2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,243
Limited English proficient students	26,537
Students who are homeless	
Migratory students	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,333
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,305
Black, non-Hispanic	2,724
Hispanic	31,984
White, non-Hispanic	75,512
Total	118,858
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	219	2,418			2,637
K	3,622	14,598			18,220
1	3,722	14,249			17,971
2	3,739	13,534			17,273
3	3,775	13,183			16,958
4	3,635	12,639			16,274
5	3,193	11,666			14,859
6	2,099	8,149			10,248
7	673	2,197			2,870
8	507	2,205			2,712
9	553	987			1,540
10	693	548			1,241
11	553	620			1,173
12	417	692			1,109
Ungraded					
TOTALS	27,400	97,685			125,085
<b>Comments:</b>					

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

#### 2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections request data about the participation of students in TAS.

##### 2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	119,426
Reading/language arts	119,426
Science	0
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

##### 2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	9,010
Other support services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set B.

### 2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	13.40	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	45.60	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	0.00	
Clerical support staff	2.40	
Administrators (non-clerical)	5.40	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:*
  - (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
  - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
  - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
  - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
  - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
  - (6) Acting as a translator; or
  - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.*
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraquidance.doc>.*

1 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

### 2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	<b>Paraprofessionals FTE</b>	<b>Percentage Qualified</b>
Paraprofessionals3	440.00	99.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. 3 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

## 2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

### 2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

#### 2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	2
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
  
4. Do not use rounding rules. The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	58
2. Adults participating	62
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	41
4. Participating children	104
a. Birth through 2 years	41
b. Age 3 through 5	39
c. Age 6 through 8	24
c. Above age 8	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	32
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	37
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	29
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	31
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	26
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	14
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	8
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	14
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	22
5. Total families enrolled	58
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading: Utah's expectation is 80% of adults will advance to the next level after 60-80 hours of instruction. 2007-8 results were 64%. Adults made significant learning gains, but we consider this an area that still needs improvement.
2. LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading: Utah's expectation is 80% of adults after 60-80 hours of instruction. 2007-8 RESULTS: 64% Adults made significant learning gains, but consider this an area still needing improvement.
3. Percentage of school age adults earning a high school diploma: Utah's expectation is that 100% of school age participants who have a diploma as a goal will receive a diploma by the end of the school year. 2007-8 Results: Goal not met by the one school-age adult with that goal.
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED: Utah's expectation is that 100% of non-school adult participants who have as a goal will take and pass one or more sections of the GED or receive a GED or a diploma by the end of the program year. 2007-8 Results: 100% as one non-school age adult met the goal of a high school diploma. In 2007-8 with non-school-age adults, a realistic GED goal was not evaluated by one program and some adults were not in the program long enough to realistically achieve their goals during the year.
5. Children entering Kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development: PPVT results were influenced by the six month criteria for age eligibility and one program did not administer pre and post on the Head Start children. The collaboration for Even Start and Early Reading First programs where the 4 yr olds are placed has not been strong. We have done extensive professional development and feel this is being corrected. We expect to see gains on the measurement this year.
6. The average number of letters children can identify as measured by the PALS pre-K upper case letter naming subtask: Utah's 2007-08 expectation is 80% who have been in the program over 7 months RESULTS: 19.7. The assessment's expectation for this age group is between 12-21 letters. Indicator was met
7. Percentage of school age children reading on grade level: Utah's expectation is 60% as measured by the teacher using DIBELS. RESULTS: 18 out of 23, or 78%, for all grades. Indicator was met.
8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities: Utah's expectation is 50% of parent participants will demonstrate a .3 gain as measured by the PEP. RESULTS: PEP scale I 89%, PEP scale II 81% and PEP scale III 78%. Indicator was met.

**2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading**

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2. Note:

Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	11	N<10	Utah's definition for significant learning gain is "increase to next level."
CASAS			
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading**

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST	10	N<10	
CASAS	18	11	
TABE			
Other	10	N<10	This is data for BEST Plus.
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<10	0	
GED			
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<10	N<10	
GED	N<10	N<10	This data is for one program only. The other program did not evaluate realistic goals.
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development**

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	N<10	N<10	0	0	One program did not test Headstart children.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					

**Comments: Utah recognizes that these outcomes are not ideal. To address the need, significant professional development has been initiated in SY 2008-09.**

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

**2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills**

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	N<10	N<10	0	0	One program did not test Headstart children.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					

**Comments: Utah recognizes that these outcomes are not ideal. To address the need, significant professional development has been initiated in SY 2008-09.**

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

### 2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	N<10	N<10	0	19.7	
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

### 2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	N<10	N<10	The DIBELS was administered by the teacher.
1	N<10	N<10	The DIBELS was administered by the teacher.
2	N<10	N<10	The DIBELS was administered by the teacher.
3	N<10	N<10	The DIBELS was administered by the teacher.
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities**

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	<b># In Cohort</b>	<b># Who Met Goal</b>	<b>Explanation (if applicable)</b>
PEP Scale I	27	24	
PEP Scale II	27	22	
PEP Scale III	27	21	
PEP Scale IV			Utah does not use this scale.
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

## 2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

### 2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

#### 2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	50
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	2,195
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

### 2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	134
K	17
1	84
2	131
3	104
4	112
5	88
6	95
7	73
8	56
9	69
10	56
11	44
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,069
<b>Comments: Migrant students populations notably decreased in SY 2007-08.</b>	

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

#### **FAQ on priority for services:**

*Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.*

### 2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP)</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	176
K	146
1	156
2	143
3	128
4	145
5	110
6	118
7	107
8	84
9	87
10	67
11	64
12	22
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,562
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA)</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	14
1	31
2	12
3	13
4	32
5	25
6	26
7	23
8	17
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	238
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	25	18	N<10	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	100	112	97	41
K	30	65	52	32
1	38	54	50	53
2	41	43	58	28
3	29	41	38	41
4	21	56	52	37
5	29	34	39	39
6	19	37	47	39
7	23	40	42	35
8	15	33	47	24
9	16	30	38	20
10	18	25	35	39
11	N<10	27	27	34
12	N<10	12	17	18
Ungraded	0	0	0	0
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	N<10	11
Total	421	630	653	491

**Comments: The Utah MEP has developed its own state migrant student data system. The system is called MAPS. MAPS is an electronic, online system in which all MEP student data is entered by LEAs and approved by the SEA. MAPS allows the Utah MEP to assist the Utah Data Warehouse more accurately to identify eligible migrant students. MAPS also will aggregate or disaggregate data in any manner requested. MAPS is the system that was utilized to calculate the last qualifying moves for this particular table. If there are changes in the numbers of migrant students reported for this table it is in correlation with the decrease in migrant student populations in Utah. All MAPS data are matched by unique MEP number to students' state student identification numbers in the Utah State Data Warehouse to ensure that the reported data are the same.**

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

### 2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	32
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	241
K	119
1	135
2	117
3	96
4	110
5	99
6	92
7	99
8	84
9	74
10	76
11	55
12	35
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	20
Total	1,484
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

OMB NO. 1810-0614 Page 28

### 2.3.2 Academic Status

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

#### 2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	0
8	0
9	N<10
10	10
11	12
12	10
Ungraded	N<10
Total	36

**Comments:** The data for this table were obtained through the coordination between the Utah MEP student data system (MAPS) and the Utah State Office of Education Data Warehouse. These numbers are representative of data as reported by Utah school districts and Utah MEPs.

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

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

*How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."*

**2.3.2.2 GED**

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

<b>Obtained a GED in your state</b>	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

#### 2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	149	137
4	166	151
5	141	131
6	142	131
7	140	126
8	119	111
9	104	90
10	117	90
11	97	75
12	49	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1,224	1,042
<b>Comments: Due to the new migrant data system, the USOE has increased ability to match test data with enrollment data.</b>		

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

#### 2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	149	137
4	166	158
5	141	132
6	142	138
7	140	108
8	119	99
9	104	60
10	117	69
11	97	47
12	49	N<10
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1,224	951
<b>Comments: Due to the new migrant data system, the USOE has increased ability to match test data with enrollment data.</b>		

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

### 2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1-3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

#### 2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the regular school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

##### 2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	12
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	47
K	90
1	113
2	91
3	74
4	93
5	87
6	70
7	80
8	77
9	53
10	71
11	69
12	34
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	1,072

**Comments: The overall eligible migrant student count has decreased since 2006/2007 program year. This decrease in student counts is directly correlated to the decrease of MEP students served during the regular school year. Where there are fewer students residing in Utah, there are fewer students to report as being served during the regular school year.**

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

### 2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	21
K	N<10
1	12
2	53
3	41
4	58
5	48
6	42
7	34
8	28
9	29
10	29
11	32
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	435
<b>Comments: There were notably few migrant students in Utah during SY 2007-08.</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
K	20
1	25
2	16
3	N<10
4	21
5	16
6	16
7	18
8	14
9	10
10	12
11	10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	212
<b>Comments: There were notably fewer migrant students in Utah during SY 2007-08.</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

#### FAQ on Services:

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

### 2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18
K	88
1	111
2	89
3	73
4	92
5	85
6	70
7	77
8	74
9	50
10	65
11	69
12	31
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	993
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	18	
K	88	87	
1	108	104	
2	89	86	
3	73	70	
4	91	89	
5	83	82	
6	70	70	
7	76	75	
8	74	74	
9	50	48	10
10	65	64	11
11	69	68	10
12	31	31	N<10
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	N<10
Total	985	967	36

**Comments: There were notably fewer eligible migrant students reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. This, in part, explains a decrease in numbers of high school -aged migrant students or out of school youth and thusly the number of high school -aged migrant students and/or out of school youth available to receive high school credits. LEA/MEP needs assessments may have also not identified this migrant student population as priority for service students and thusly provided fewer of these services.**

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

#### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	12	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	36	N<10
K	34	N<10
1	35	N<10
2	29	N<10
3	16	N<10
4	35	11
5	33	N<10
6	13	N<10
7	32	10
8	28	N<10
9	25	12
10	26	N<10
11	24	N<10
12	10	N<10
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	11	N<10
Total	399	84
<p><b>Comments: There were notably fewer eligible migrant students reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. This, in part, explains a decrease in numbers of explains the change in the number of these services reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. Also, LEA/MEP needs assessments may have determined that these services were not as great a priority as other services provided.</b></p>		

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

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- a. What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

#### 2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	47
<p><b>Comments: There were notably fewer eligible migrant students reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. This, in part, explains a decrease in numbers of explains the change in the number of these services reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. Also, LEA/MEP needs assessments may have determined that these services were not as great a priority as other services provided.</b></p>	

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

### 2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is ED Facts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

#### 2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<10
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	1,060
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	119
K	14
1	16
2	56
3	63
4	67
5	47
6	52
7	32
8	21
9	37
10	23
11	20
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	568
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	18
1	32
2	23
3	25
4	26
5	23
6	15
7	17
8	N<10
9	14
10	19
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	265
<b>Comments: There were notably fewer migrant students in Utah during SY 2007-08.</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

#### FAQ on Services:

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

**2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	172
K	82
1	100
2	87
3	81
4	82
5	71
6	65
7	41
8	34
9	46
10	49
11	42
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	963
<p><b>Comments: Apparently, this comment was erroneously submitted. Reported changes in the type of MEP services provided and the time of the program year in which they are provided is reflective of the LEA/MEP's needs assessment and plans for service delivery to address those needs. LEA/MEP do needs assessments and service delivery plans annually, so the types of services and times of the program year in which these services change as the eligible migrant students' needs change.</b></p>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	172	171	
K	82	81	
1	100	98	
2	87	87	
3	81	80	
4	82	82	
5	71	70	
6	65	65	
7	41	41	
8	34	34	
9	46	46	30
10	49	49	31
11	42	42	19
12	N<10	N<10	N<10
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	N<10
Total	963	957	90
<b>Comments: There were notably fewer migrant students in Utah for SY 2007-08.</b>			

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

#### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	N<10
K	N<10	0
1	N<10	0
2	N<10	0
3	N<10	0
4	N<10	N<10
5	N<10	0
6	N<10	N<10
7	N<10	N<10
8	N<10	N<10
9	N<10	N<10
10	0	0
11	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10
Total	60	12
<p><b>Comments: There were notably fewer eligible migrant students reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. This, in part, explains a decrease in numbers of explains the change in the number of these services reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. Also, LEA/MEP needs assessments may have determined that these services were not as great a priority as other services provided.</b></p>		

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

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

#### 2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	0
3	0
4	N<10
5	0
6	N<10
7	0
8	0
9	N<10
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	N<10
<p><b>Comments: There were notably fewer eligible migrant students reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. This, in part, explains a decrease in numbers of explains the change in the number of these services reported during the 2007/2008 MEP program year. Also, LEA/MEP needs assessments may have determined that these services were not as great a priority as other services provided.</b></p>	

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

### 2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Program Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	50
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	2,195
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.4 School Data

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

#### 2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	173
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	2,162
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children participating in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	40	334
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	17	676
Year round	54	602
<b>Comments: There were notably fewer migrant students in Utah during SY 2007-08.</b>		

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

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*
- e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

**2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data**

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

**2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel**

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

**2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director**

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

<b>State Director FTE</b>	0.80
<b>Comments:</b> The State migrant director's staff time has been reduced to cover other Title I duties.	

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

**FAQs on the MEP State director**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.*
- b. *Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

**2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff**

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	4	3.00	69	64.00
Counselors	0	0.00	4	4.00
All paraprofessionals	45	20.50	98	90.00
Recruiters	10	6.50	5	5.00
Records transfer staff	2	0.10	2	1.00
<b>Comments: There were notably fewer migrant students in Utah during SY 2007-08 resulting in fewer migrant staff.</b>				

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

**FAQs on MEP staff:**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
  - i. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  - ii. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*
- e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

**2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals**

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	37	11.60	68	56.60
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

**FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
  - i. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  - ii. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

**2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

**2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1**

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	5	97
Juvenile detention	3	42
Juvenile corrections	8	108
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	3	149
Total	20	38

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	<b>#</b>
<b>Programs in a multiple purpose facility</b>	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:**

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

**2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>State Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
Neglected Programs	5
Juvenile Detention	3
Juvenile Corrections	8
Adult Corrections	1
Other	3
Total	20
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	586	3,432	528	194	208
Long Term Students Served	486	2,244	526	161	191

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	28	96	18	N<10	N<10
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	163	19	14	11
Black, non-Hispanic	38	176	28	N<10	10
Hispanic	78	1,065	167	74	55
White, non-Hispanic	428	1,932	296	93	123
Total	586	3,432	528	194	208

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	397	2,556	460	170	139
Female	189	876	68	24	69
Total	586	3,432	528	194	208

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	12	18	0	0	0
11	27	19	0	0	0
12	20	43	N<10	0	0
13	36	169	13	0	N<10
14	95	942	55	0	11
15	68	785	71	0	92
16	120	769	151	N<10	37
17	182	595	127	N<10	38
18	21	73	85	15	15
19	N<10	19	20	35	0
20	0	0	N<10	63	N<10
21	0	0	0	72	N<10
Total	586	3,432	528	194	208

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This

response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments: FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.*

### 2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

<b># Programs That</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities</b>	<b>Adult Corrections Facilities</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)	4	11	1	2
Awarded high school diploma(s)	3	7	1	1
Awarded GED(s)	1	1	1	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

##### 2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	412	2,311	88	162
Enrolled in a GED program	N<10	20	51	N<10
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

##### 2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	26	464	0	13
Earned a GED	N<10	20	14	N<10
Obtained high school diploma	N<10	35	42	18
Were accepted into post-secondary education	N<10	272	25	N<10
Enrolled in post-secondary education	N<10	267	25	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

#### 2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	333	2,499	135	167
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	318	2,237	140	174
Obtained employment	13	N<10	155	N<10
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

#### 2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pretested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	273	241	152	10
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	201	427	161	N<10

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	66	54	40	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	86	79	N<10
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	31	100	N<10	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	64	88	18	N<10
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	31	99	16	N<10
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.*

### 2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	210	382	155	11
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	105	379	161	N<10

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	18	41	29	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	38	97	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	23	124	N<10	N<10
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	19	77	16	N<10
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	36	99	13	N<10
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

**2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

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

**2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

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

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

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>	

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

**2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>	

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

**2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2**

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served					
Total Long Term Students Served					

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian or Pacific Islander					
Black, non-Hispanic					
Hispanic					
White, non-Hispanic					
Total					

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male					
Female					
Total					

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
Total					

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.**

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

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.*

**2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

<b>LEA Programs That</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention/ Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)				
Awarded high school diploma(s)				
Awarded GED(s)				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

**2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2**

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

**2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits				
Enrolled in a GED program				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

**2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school				
Earned a GED				
Obtained high school diploma				
Were accepted into post-secondary education				
Enrolled in post-secondary education				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

**2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2**

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

**2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

**2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education				
Obtained employment				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

### 2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

#### 2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry				
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)				

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams				
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

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

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.*

**2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry				
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)				

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams				
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education does not receive Title I Part D Subpart 2 funding.</b>				

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

**2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)**

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease or hold steady the number of "persistently dangerous schools" as defined by Board Rule R277-483. "Persistently Dangerous Schools."	Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Effectiveness Report	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: 2005-2006 High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2005-06: 2005-2006 High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2003
				2006-07: 2006-2007 High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0			
				2007-08: 2007-08 High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0			
<b>Comments: The Utah State Office of Education continues to work with districts to ensure that keeping schools safe and conducive to learning is a top priority.</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Favorable Attitudes to Antisocial Behaviors"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2007		2005-06: 6th Grade 31.2%, 8th Grade 29.9%, 10th Grade 38.3%, 12th Grade 35.9%	6th Grade 30.5% 8th Grade 25.4% 10th Grade 35.3% 12th Grade 36.1%	2003
				2005-06:			
				2006-07: 2006-07 Grade 28.9%, 8th Grade 27.6%, 10th Grade 37.1%, 12th			
				2007-08: 2007-2008 The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring.			

**Comments: SHARP PNA Survey Changes for 2007** For each of the risk and protective factors scales, there is a value (a cutpoint) that determines whether students' responses to the scale questions place them at risk of engaging in problem behaviors or provides them with protection from engaging in problem behaviors. For each school, school district, Local Substance Abuse Authority, and the State of Utah, the results are presented as the percentage of students at risk and the percentage of students with protection for each of the risk and protective factor scales. In 2007, some of the cutpoints that were used to determine the students who are at risk and those with protection were changed. All changes were based on the analysis of the survey results from eight states across the nation, and were made to update the cutpoints and make them more representative of youth nation-wide. In order to be able to compare the results from the current data from the 2007 survey to the data from the two earlier PNA surveys (2003 and 2005), the data from those surveys were reanalyzed with the new cutpoints. Thus, some of the risk and protective factor values from the original 2003 and 2005 reports (which were reported on CSPR in previous years) will not exactly match the 2003 and 2005 values found in the 2007 reports. This has not been a problem for prevention planning since the new values accurately represent the trends in risk and protection over time. Further, the new analysis provides prevention planners with the ability to compare the percentage of students at risk and with protection to a more national sample for each of the risk and protective factor scales. Please note that the data from 2007-08 is the same as was reported in 2006-07. The USOE will be doing another survey in the spring of 2009 and that will be reported next year.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Favorable Attitudes toward Drug Use"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2007	2005-06:	2005-06: 6th Grade 31.2%, 8th Grade 29.9%, 10th Grade 38.3%, 12th Grade 35.9%	6th Grade 11.5% 8th Grade 12.8% 10th Grade 16.1% 12th Grade 15.6%	2003
				2006-07:	2006-07: 2006-07 6th Grade 9.5%, 8th Grade 17.8%, 10th Grade 23.2%, 12th Grade 18.8%		
				2007-08:	2007-08: The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring.		

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Comments: SHARP PNA Survey Changes for 2007** For each of the risk and protective factors scales, there is a value (a cutpoint) that determines whether students' responses to the scale questions place them at risk of engaging in problem behaviors or provides them with protection from engaging in problem behaviors. For each school, school district, Local Substance Abuse Authority, and the State of Utah, the results are presented as the percentage of students at risk and the percentage of students with protection for each of the risk and protective factor scales. In 2007, some of the cutpoints that were used to determine the students who are at risk and those with protection were changed. All changes were based on the analysis of the survey results from eight states across the nation, and were made to update the cutpoints and make them more representative of youth nation-wide. In order to be able to compare the results from the current data from the 2007 survey to the data from the two earlier PNA surveys (2003 and 2005), the data from those surveys were reanalyzed with the new cutpoints. Thus, some of the risk and protective factor values from the original 2003 and 2005 reports (which were reported on CSPR in previous years) will not exactly match the 2003 and 2005 values found in the 2007 reports. This has not been a problem for prevention planning since the new values accurately represent the trends in risk and protection over time. Further, the new analysis provides prevention planners with the ability to compare the percentage of students at risk and with protection to a more national sample for each of the risk and protective factor scales. Please note that the data from 2007-08 is the same as was reported for 2006-07. The USOE will be doing another survey this spring of 2009 and that will be reported next year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Intentions to use ATODs"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2007	2005-06:	2005-06: 6th Grade 22.2%, 8th Grade 15.3%, 10th Grade 19.7%, 12th Grade 12.3%	6th Grade 23.0% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 16.4% 12th Grade 12.0%	2003
				2006-07: 2006-07 6th Grade 20.3%, 8th Grade 13.4%, 10th Grade 18.7%, 12th Grade 19.2%			

				2007-08: The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring.			

**Comments: SHARP PNA Survey Changes for 2007** For each of the risk and protective factors scales, there is a value (a cutpoint) that determines whether students' responses to the scale questions place them at risk of engaging in problem behaviors or provides them with protection from engaging in problem behaviors. For each school, school district, Local Substance Abuse Authority, and the State of Utah, the results are presented as the percentage of students at risk and the percentage of students with protection for each of the risk and protective factor scales. In 2007, some of the cutpoints that were used to determine the students who are at risk and those with protection were changed. All changes were based on the analysis of the survey results from eight states across the nation, and were made to update the cutpoints and make them more representative of youth nation-wide. In order to be able to compare the results from the current data from the 2007 survey to the data from the two earlier PNA surveys (2003 and 2005), the data from those surveys were reanalyzed with the new cutpoints. Thus, some of the risk and protective factor values from the original 2003 and 2005 reports (which were reported on CSPR in previous years) will not exactly match the 2003 and 2005 values found in the 2007 reports. This has not been a problem for prevention planning since the new values accurately represent the trends in risk and protection over time. Further, the new analysis provides prevention planners with the ability to compare the percentage of students at risk and with protection to a more national sample for each of the risk and protective factor scales. Please note that data from 2007-08 is the same as was reported for 2006-07. The USOE will be doing another survey during the spring of 2009 and that will be reported next year.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2007	2005-06:	2005-06: 6th Grade 21.8%, 8th Grade 25.1%, 10th Grade 19.9%, 12th Grade 23.4%	6th Grade 19.5% 8th Grade 20.2% 10th Grade	2003

"Perceived risk of Drug Use"				2006-07: 6th Grade 31.1%, 8th Grade 22.6%, 10th Grade 29.1%, 12th Grade 22.6%		16.8% 12th Grade 23.6%	
				2007-08: The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring.			

**Comments: SHARP PNA Survey Changes for 2007** For each of the risk and protective factors scales, there is a value (a cutpoint) that determines whether students' responses to the scale questions place them at risk of engaging in problem behaviors or provides them with protection from engaging in problem behaviors. For each school, school district, Local Substance Abuse Authority, and the State of Utah the results are presented as the percentage of students at risk and the percentage of students with protection for each of the risk and protective factor scales. In 2007, some of the cutpoints that were used to determine the students who are at risk and those with protection were changed. All changes were based on the analysis of the survey results from eight states across the nation, and were made to update the cutpoints and make them more representative of youth nation-wide. In order to be able to compare the results from the current data from the 2007 survey to the data from the two earlier PNA surveys (2003 and 2005), the data from those surveys were reanalyzed with the new cutpoints. Thus, some of the risk and protective factor values from the original 2003 and 2005 reports (which were reported on CSPR in previous years) will not exactly match the 2003 and 2005 values found in the 2007 reports. This has not been a problem for prevention planning since the new values accurately represent the trends in risk and protection over time. Further, the new analysis provides prevention planners with the ability to compare the percentage of students at risk and with protection to a more national sample for each of the risk and protective factor scales. Please note that data from 2007-08 is the same as reported in the 2006-07. The USOE will be doing another survey during the spring of 2009 and that will be reported next year.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	---------	--------------------	----------	---------------------------

				<p>2005-06: 6th Grade Alcohol 2.1%, Tobacco 1.3%, Marijuana 0.4%, Inhalants 3.8%, 8th Grade Alcohol 9.3%, Tobacco 4.1%, Marijuana 3.0%, Inhalants 5.3%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.7%, Tobacco 8.4%, Marijuana 7.4%, Inhalants 3.1%, 12th Grade Alcohol 20.5%, Tobacco 11.0%, Marijuana 9.5%, Inhalants 1.6%</p>		
			<p>2005-06:</p>			
			<p>2006-07: 2006-07 6th Grade Alcohol 1.8%, Tobacco 0.7%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.1%, 8th Grade Alcohol 8.7%, Tobacco 3.4%, Marijuana 2.4%, Inhalants 3.3%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 7.6%, Marijuana 6.5%, Inhalants 2.2%, 12th Grade Alcohol 19.0%, Tobacco 9.7%, Marijuana 7.4%, Inhalant 1.7%</p>			

				2007-08: 2007-2008 The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring.			
Decrease the percentage of students reporting "30 day use of ATODs"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2007	Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%		6th Grade Alcohol 1.9%, Tobacco 1.4%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 3.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 8.6%, Tobacco 3.7%, Marijuana 2.9%, Inhalants 5.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 6.9%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.3%, 12th Grade Alcohol 21.1%,	2003



				2005-06: 2005-2006 Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 373, Middle 870, High 734; Fighting Explusions, Elementary 0, Middle 7, High 6; Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 166, Middle 279, High 185; Weapons Explusions, Elementary 4, Middle 12, High 8; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 2, Middle 149, High 295; Alcohol Explusions, Elementary 0, Middle 1, High 4; Illicit Drug Suspensions, Elementary 31, Middle 580, High 1038; Illicit Drug Explusions, Elementary 0, Middle 18, High 38;	Baseline: Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 343, Middle 911, High 410; Fighting Explusions, Elementary 1, Middle 5, High 3;
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>2006-07: 2006-07 Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 382, Middle 1169, High 543; Fighting Explosions, Elementary 1, Middle 1, High 4; Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 178, Middle 267, High 185; Weapons Explosions, Elementary 1, Middle 4, High 17; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 1, Middle 156, High 249; Alcohol Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 0, High 0; Illicit Drug Suspensions, Elementary 46, Middle 696, High 977; Illicit Drug Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 20, High 42;</p>		
				<p>2007-08: 2007-08 Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 427, Middle</p>		

Decrease the number of suspensions and expulsions for safe school violations and use/possession of ATODs..	Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Effectiveness Report	Annually	2008	2007-08:	1073, High 577; Fighting Explosions, Elementary 3, Middle 40, High 17; Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 223, Middle 276, High 188; Weapons Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 4, High 2; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 5, Middle 70, High 271; Alcohol Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 0, High 1; Illicit Drug Suspensions,	Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 156, Middle 230, High 156; Weapons Explosions, Elementary 1, Middle 19, High 23; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 14, Middle 108, High 252; Alcohol Explosions,	2005

				Elementary 41, Middle 668, High 1099; Illicit Drug Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 5, High 21;	Elementary 0, Middle 1, High 0; Illicit Drug Suspensions, Elementary 63, Middle 580, High 895; Illicit Drug Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 30, High 52;	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

**Comments: The USOE continue to work with districts and charter schools in consistently collecting the data and asking districts to compare their own yearly data to determine the effectiveness of implemented prevention strategies.**

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

## 2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

### 2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Alcohol --Any product containing at least .0063% alcohol by volume or .005% alcohol by weight. Examples include beer, wine, and spirits (vodka, gins, whiskey, rum, cordials, etc.).
Illicit drug related	Controlled Substance -A drug or other substance regulated by the Controlled Substances Act [Title 58, chapter 37, UCA]. Examples include methamphetamine, LSD, designer drugs, phencyclidine (PCP), heroin, etc. Also included in this category is the unauthorized possession or use of a prescription drug such as amphetamines, barbiturates, Valium, codeine, and Ritalin. Uncontrolled Substance (Over-the-Counter, Inhalants, Lookalikes) -A substance which can be legally purchased without prescription, if its manner of use or apparent intended use is for a purpose other than that intended by the manufacturer. Examples include over-the-counter (non-prescription) and mail order (look-alike) drugs such as cold medicines, cough syrup, diet pills, sleeping pills, NoDoz, and nicotine patches. Also included in this category are common substances abused as inhalants including hair spray, gasoline, butane, rubber cement, glue, furniture polish, air fresheners, spray paint, liquid correction fluid, inhalers, breath spray, felt tip markers, propane gas, cleaning fluids, tape head cleaners, aerosol whipped cream propellants, vegetable sprays, paint-thinners, degreasers, and art or office supply solvents. Drug Paraphernalia --Any item used or intended for use in the creation, distribution, or use of a controlled substance [Title 58, Chapter 37a, UCA], e.g. syringes, bongs, roach clips, pipes, water pipes, clips, spoons, needles, etc. Other Drug -Alcohol / Drug offenses that do not fit in any of the current categories. For example, the possession of any substance that substantially resembles or is meant to represent any illegal drug or unauthorized substance. Unknown Drug--A person who appears to be under the influence of a psychoactive substance but the substance is unknown.
Violent incident without physical injury	Violent incident--An incident in the assault violations, weapons violations, and other incidents including: bullying, kidnapping, actual or attempted robbery, sexual offenses and threat or intimidation which is committed without a physical injury.
Violent incident with physical injury	Violent incident--An incident in the assault violations, weapons violations, and other incidents including: bullying, kidnapping, actual or attempted robbery, sexual offenses and threat or intimidation which is committed resulting in a physical injury. Physical injury is defined as damage to bodily tissue that includes: skin bruising, dislocation, impairment of physical function, bleeding, burn, bone fracture, soft tissue swelling, injury to an internal organ or any physical condition that imperils the health/welfare of a student.

Weapons possession

Type of Weapon -Select either Real or Look-Alike. If both a real and look-alike weapon are possessed (i.e., real handgun and look alike handgun), select "Real". Real -A weapon capable of performing the action implied by its category (i.e., A "handgun" capable of firing a projectile with deadly force or a "Knife or Sharpened Edge" capable of cutting.). Look-Alike -object, device or instrument having or made to have the appearance of a weapon. Examples include weapons that are broken or non-functional, toy guns and knives, devices made to look like bombs, and any object that is a non-functioning facsimile of a real weapon. Type of Violation -Select one of the following (ordered from

most to least severe): Used, Threatened Use, or Possession. If two apply, select the more severe violation to report.

Used -The weapon was employed (i.e., a handgun was fired, a stabbing or attempted stabbing took place, an explosive device was detonated, etc.).

Threatened -The weapon (or look alike) was brandished or its presence made known and an intention to use was indicated.

Possession --Having real or look alike weapons on their person, in their locker, under their control, or in their custody.

Categories of Weapons -There are five categories of weapons in the system: Handgun; Rifle/Shotgun; BB/Pellet Gun; Knife/Sharpened Edge; and Other Weapon, Firearm or Explosive Device.

Handgun --A firearm having a short stock designed to be held and fired by the use of a single hand and easily concealed upon the person.

Examples include pistols, derringers, and revolvers.

Rifle --A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder and to use the energy of the explosive in a fixed metallic cartridge to fire a projectile through a rifled bore.

Shotgun --A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder and to use the energy of the explosive in a shotgun shell to fire either a number of ball shot or a single slug through a smooth bore.

BB or Pellet Gun --Weapons where a small BB, pellet, or other projectile (usually 18 caliber or less) is fired through the use of a powerful spring or compressed gas mechanism.

Knife / Sharpened Edge --Any object with a sharpened edge such as a knife, bayonet, razor blade, machete, sword, etc. Objects with

sharpened points such as scissors, darts, spikes, nails, and pencils are "other" weapons.

Other Weapon, Firearm or Explosive Device -All other weapons. All objects, devices, instruments, materials, or substances, whether animate or inanimate, used or intended to be used to inflict death or serious bodily injury that do not fit in the previous categories.

Examples include:

-Explosive or incendiary devices, rockets, missiles, etc.

-Dangerous materials intended to be used or actually used to inflict harm on or intimidate any person. For examples, see the Dangerous Material definition.

-Objects used as weapons -pencils, broken bottles or glass, chains, rocks, clubs, tire irons, darts, nails, rope, automobile, etc.

-Unconventional weapons -spear gun, dart gun, sling shot, bow and arrow, cross bow, spear, martial arts weapons (nunchakus, throwing stars, etc.), electrical weapons or devices (stun guns, zip guns, etc.), blow guns, tear gas, pepper spray, etc.

**Comments:**

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

### 2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

#### 2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	0	0
<b>Comments: This category was new to last year's report and the USOE requires some lead time to implement collection of new data. Districts will be reporting on this data in the 2008-09 CSPR.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	0	0
<b>Comments: This category was new to last year's report and the USOE requires some lead time to implement collection of new data. Districts will be reporting on this data in the 2008-09 CSPR.</b>		

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

### 2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

#### 2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	0	0
<b>Comments: This category was new to last year's report and the USOE requires some lead time to implement collection of new data. Districts will be reporting on this data in the 2008-09 CSPR.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	0	0
<b>Comments: This category was new to last year's report and the USOE requires some lead time to implement collection of new data. Districts will be reporting on this data in the 2008-09 CSPR.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

##### 2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	223	50
6 through 8	276	62
9 through 12	188	58

**Comments: The USOE continues to work with the LEAs on this data in terms of definitions, collecting and reportings to improve accuracy and to increase usage among LEAs in reviewing yearly trends. With the completion of the three year data collection grant, the USOE has implemented practices in supporting districts/charter schools in more consistent data reporting.**

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

##### 2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	50
6 through 8	N<10	62
9 through 12	N<10	58

**Comments: The USOE continues to work with the LEAs on this data in terms of definitions, collecting and reportings to improve accuracy and to increase usage among LEAs in reviewing yearly trends. With the completion of the three year data collection grant, the USOE has implemented practices in supporting districts/charter schools in more consistent data reporting.**

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

### 2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

#### 2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	50
6 through 8	70	62
9 through 12	271	58

**Comments: The USOE continues to work with the LEAs on this data in terms of definitions, collecting and reportings to improve accuracy and to increase usage among LEAs in reviewing yearly trends. With the completion of the three year data collection grant, the USOE has implemented practices in supporting districts/charter schools in more consistent data reporting.**

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

#### 2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	50
6 through 8	0	62
9 through 12	N<10	58

**Comments: The USOE continues to work with the LEAs on this data in terms of definitions, collecting and reportings to improve accuracy and to increase usage among LEAs in reviewing yearly trends. With the completion of the three year data collection grant, the USOE has implemented practices in supporting districts/charter schools in more consistent data reporting.**

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

### 2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

#### 2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	41	50
6 through 8	668	62
9 through 12	1,099	58

**Comments: The USOE continues to work with the LEAs on this data in terms of definitions, collecting and reportings to improve accuracy and to increase usage among LEAs in reviewing yearly trends. With the completion of the three year data collection grant, the USOE has implemented practices in supporting districts/charter schools in more consistent data reporting.**

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

#### 2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	50
6 through 8	N<10	62
9 through 12	21	58

**Comments: The USOE continues to work with the LEAs on this data in terms of definitions, collecting and reportings to improve accuracy and to increase usage among LEAs in reviewing yearly trends. With the completion of the three year data collection grant, the USOE has implemented practices in supporting districts/charter schools in more consistent data reporting.**

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

### 2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
No	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah is in the third year of the Parents Empowered effort. This is a statewide media campaign which is focused on parent/child communication about alcohol and is aimed at reducing underage alcohol use. This is a joint effort between the USOE and the Division of Substance Abuse, Division of Highway Safety, Division of Alcohol Beverage Control, MADD, the Attorney General's Office, Utah Crime Council, Department of Health and the Local Substance Abuse Prevention Providers. Our media partners (R & R Partners) lead out in this successful campaign.

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

## **2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)**

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

### **2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary**

Section 5122 of ESEA, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

**Please attach your statewide summary.** You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

### 2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments		
Total received Title V, Part A funds	74	
<b>Comments: Utah does not have data regarding LEA needs assessments conducted in 2007-08.</b>		

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

### 2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	777,759	95.3
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	815,924	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP**

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of **these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).**
2. That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	<b># LEAs</b>	<b># LEAs Met AYP</b>
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	66	60
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	8	6
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	74	66
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**

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

**2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)**

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
<b>Comments: No LEAs tranferred funds during 2008-09.</b>	

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

**2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds**

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	
Parental involvement activities	
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	
<b>Comments: Utah does not participate in RLIS.</b>	

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

### 2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah does not participate in RLIS.

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

**2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**

**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2007-08?	No Response
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds**

	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)		
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		

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

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)		
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*