

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 2008-09

UTAH



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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: 801-538-7768

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

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

Monday, March 8, 2010, 5:05:24 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The state will be adopting the Common Core standards in mathematics and English Language Arts. Upon their release the state will undertake a review process and make necessary revisions to the state's core curricula. The K-2 science content standards were rewritten in the summer of 2009 and are currently being reviewed and revised prior to board adoption. The 3-12 science content standards are current under review. A revision process will be undertaken during the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years if the review process reveals deficiencies or changes that must be made. Implementation of revised standards will take place in 2011-12.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Criterion-referenced tests for mathematics (grades 2-6 and in courses Math 7, Pre-Algebra, Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2) and secondary reading/language arts have been adjusted to reflect curriculum changes. These assessments were implemented in 2008 (Secondary ELA) and 2009 (mathematics) with an intermediary form for mathematics used in 2008. New academic achievement standards for mathematics were set in summer 2009 and were applied to the 2009 criterion-referenced tests in every grade level and course except Algebra 2. New academic achievement standards for Secondary ELA were set in 2009 and were applied to the 2009 criterion-referenced tests.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Utah has criterion referenced tests in science for each grade level 4-8 and high school courses in Earth Systems, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Assessments will be adjusted as necessary to reflect changes in the core curricula after adoption of the Common Core standards for implementation in the 2011-12 school year.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	262,283		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,684		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,930		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	4,007		>97%
Hispanic	38,869		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	205,389		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,188		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,918		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	94,376		>97%
Migratory students	775		>97%
Male	134,071		>97%
Female	128,212		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,322	44.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	18,997	55.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	43	0.1
Total	34,362	
Comments: The data in table 1.2.1 are from the October enrollment counts. The data in 1.2.2 are from the December Special Education report. Therefore, the numbers vary slightly due to changes in populations during that time.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	284,960		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,954		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,706		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	4,216		>97%
Hispanic	41,238		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	224,342		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	36,017		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,579		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	100,151		>97%
Migratory students	816		>97%
Male	145,851		>97%
Female	139,109		>97%
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,721	43.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	20,423	56.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	32	0.1
Total	36,176	
Comments: The data in table 1.2.3 are from the October enrollment counts. The data in 1.2.4 are from the December Special Education report. Therefore, the numbers vary slightly due to changes in populations during that time.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	295,309		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,172		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,252		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	4,352		>97%
Hispanic	41,687		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	233,342		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	34,013		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,985		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	98,253		>97%
Migratory students	789		>97%
Male	151,858		>97%
Female	143,451		>97%
Comments: It is unclear why these data vary from those in 1.3. We will check N079 and N081 to determine if a resubmission is necessary.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,925	46.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	18,524	53.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	N<10	
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	34,450	
Comments: The data in table 1.2.5 are from the October enrollment counts. The data in 1.2.6 are from the December Special Education report. Therefore, the numbers vary slightly due to changes in populations during that time.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,312	31,114	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	563	242	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,486	973	65.5
Black, non-Hispanic	699	325	46.5
Hispanic	6,683	3,083	46.1
White, non-Hispanic	34,614	26,323	76.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,471	3,042	47.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,006	1,351	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	16,941	9,661	57.0
Migratory students	160	60	37.5
Male	22,452	15,964	71.1
Female	21,860	15,150	69.3
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	44,391	35,363	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	565	338	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,488	1,143	76.8
Black, non-Hispanic	699	440	63.0
Hispanic	6,689	4,111	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	34,682	29,131	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,486	3,553	54.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,003	1,843	46.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,967	11,734	69.2
Migratory students	161	83	51.6
Male	22,490	17,167	76.3
Female	21,901	18,196	83.1
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36	31	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic	N<10	N<10	
Hispanic	N<10	N<10	
White, non-Hispanic	28	24	85.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	29	26	89.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	N<10	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	19	18	94.7
Migratory students			
Male	15	14	93.3
Female	21	17	81.0
Comments: Utah does not administer a third grade science assessment. The few numbers reported here are out-of-level testing (3rd grade students taking higher level tests).			

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43,342	31,524	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	586	283	48.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,460	1,025	70.2
Black, non-Hispanic	662	339	51.2
Hispanic	6,493	3,270	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	33,889	26,432	78.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,317	3,039	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,755	1,338	35.6
Economically disadvantaged students	16,524	9,945	60.2
Migratory students	120	47	39.2
Male	22,220	16,263	73.2
Female	21,122	15,261	72.2

Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student populations have been consistently decreasing in Utah.

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43,521	34,061	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	586	321	54.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,467	1,078	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	666	408	61.3
Hispanic	6,501	3,782	58.2
White, non-Hispanic	34,047	28,275	83.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,341	3,311	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,752	1,472	39.2
Economically disadvantaged students	16,559	11,049	66.7
Migratory students	120	54	45.0
Male	22,313	16,789	75.2
Female	21,208	17,272	81.4

Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student populations have been consistently decreasing in Utah.

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43,532	26,821	61.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	586	187	31.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,468	765	52.1
Black, non-Hispanic	665	243	36.5
Hispanic	6,508	2,126	32.7
White, non-Hispanic	34,052	23,355	68.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,339	2,528	39.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,760	617	16.4
Economically disadvantaged students	16,567	7,553	45.6
Migratory students	120	23	19.2
Male	22,313	14,274	64.0
Female	21,219	12,547	59.1
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student populations have been consistently decreasing in Utah.			

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,187	30,673	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	581	285	49.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,465	1,077	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	622	333	53.5
Hispanic	6,309	3,324	52.7
White, non-Hispanic	33,000	25,497	77.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,960	2,567	43.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,422	1,242	36.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15,772	9,525	60.4
Migratory students	145	60	41.4
Male	21,666	15,691	72.4
Female	20,521	14,982	73.0
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,379	32,393	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	583	304	52.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,476	1,086	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	623	373	59.9
Hispanic	6,326	3,537	55.9
White, non-Hispanic	33,162	26,939	81.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,977	2,690	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,425	1,143	33.4
Economically disadvantaged students	15,818	10,124	64.0
Migratory students	144	54	37.5
Male	21,777	15,914	73.1
Female	20,602	16,479	80.0
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,369	29,905	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	583	244	41.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,475	904	61.3
Black, non-Hispanic	626	305	48.7
Hispanic	6,325	2,722	43.0
White, non-Hispanic	33,150	25,581	77.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,981	2,677	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,430	805	23.5
Economically disadvantaged students	15,808	8,885	56.2
Migratory students	145	44	30.3
Male	21,777	15,594	71.6
Female	20,592	14,311	69.5
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40,550	27,758	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	569	243	42.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,313	886	67.5
Black, non-Hispanic	615	271	44.1
Hispanic	6,002	2,694	44.9
White, non-Hispanic	31,854	23,541	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,289	1,715	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,999	833	27.8
Economically disadvantaged students	14,818	8,030	54.2
Migratory students	104	45	43.3
Male	20,583	14,167	68.8
Female	19,967	13,591	68.1
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student populations have been consistently decreasing in Utah.			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40,758	32,822	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	569	336	59.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,318	1,027	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	614	407	66.3
Hispanic	6,009	3,612	60.1
White, non-Hispanic	32,048	27,290	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,302	2,400	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,986	1,097	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	14,843	10,223	68.9
Migratory students	105	55	52.4
Male	20,698	16,074	77.7
Female	20,060	16,748	83.5
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40,746	29,226	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	571	238	41.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,315	853	64.9
Black, non-Hispanic	612	296	48.4
Hispanic	6,006	2,729	45.4
White, non-Hispanic	32,042	24,980	78.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,301	2,162	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,993	773	25.8
Economically disadvantaged students	14,845	8,436	56.8
Migratory students	104	36	34.6
Male	20,681	15,290	73.9
Female	20,065	13,936	69.4

Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student populations have been consistently decreasing in Utah.

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,575	29,271	75.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	529	270	51.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,331	984	73.9
Black, non-Hispanic	534	282	52.8
Hispanic	5,491	2,848	51.9
White, non-Hispanic	30,477	24,736	81.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,310	1,885	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,471	839	34.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,124	8,232	62.7
Migratory students	88	39	44.3
Male	19,943	15,020	75.3
Female	18,632	14,251	76.5

Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39,655	32,618	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	557	340	61.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,344	1,094	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	566	395	69.8
Hispanic	5,808	3,660	63.0
White, non-Hispanic	31,165	26,953	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,562	2,049	44.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,590	971	37.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,754	9,757	70.9
Migratory students	105	47	44.8
Male	20,525	16,008	78.0
Female	19,130	16,610	86.8
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39,403	27,492	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	553	220	39.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,342	839	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic	564	263	46.6
Hispanic	5,756	2,365	41.1
White, non-Hispanic	30,973	23,667	76.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,413	1,600	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,571	491	19.1
Economically disadvantaged students	13,606	7,395	54.4
Migratory students	101	24	23.8
Male	20,382	14,264	70.0
Female	19,021	13,228	69.5
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student populations have been consistently decreasing in Utah.			

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	32,847	20,528	62.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	448	141	31.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,133	626	55.2
Black, non-Hispanic	468	185	39.5
Hispanic	4,310	1,546	35.9
White, non-Hispanic	26,308	17,920	68.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,998	947	31.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,848	345	18.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,197	4,828	47.4
Migratory students	84	31	36.9
Male	16,504	10,302	62.4
Female	16,343	10,226	62.6
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. The Utah Mathematics CRT was revised in 2009; a decrease in percent proficient was expected.			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39,032	32,258	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	570	361	63.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,302	1,041	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	583	385	66.0
Hispanic	5,507	3,433	62.3
White, non-Hispanic	30,856	26,869	87.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,271	1,867	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,319	800	34.5
Economically disadvantaged students	12,824	9,077	70.8
Migratory students	113	56	49.6
Male	19,894	15,574	78.3
Female	19,138	16,684	87.2
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,846	26,406	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	569	215	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,304	750	57.5
Black, non-Hispanic	579	237	40.9
Hispanic	5,462	1,961	35.9
White, non-Hispanic	30,718	23,104	75.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,141	1,313	31.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,289	297	13.0
Economically disadvantaged students	12,707	6,382	50.2
Migratory students	112	26	23.2
Male	19,780	13,632	68.9
Female	19,066	12,774	67.0
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change.			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,726	8,265	39.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	413	111	26.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	754	277	36.7
Black, non-Hispanic	423	120	28.4
Hispanic	3,628	863	23.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,418	6,869	44.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,037	1,215	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,478	244	16.5
Economically disadvantaged students	7,234	2,375	32.8
Migratory students	69	17	24.6
Male	10,843	4,425	40.8
Female	9,883	3,840	38.8
Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student counts have been consistently decreasing in Utah.			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36,150	30,759	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	550	373	67.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,348	1,068	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	504	343	68.1
Hispanic	4,601	3,014	65.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,000	25,837	89.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,375	1,535	45.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,622	505	31.1
Economically disadvantaged students	9,975	7,299	73.2
Migratory students	70	27	38.6
Male	18,663	15,310	82.0
Female	17,487	15,449	88.4

Comments: In the 2008-2009 school year, Utah changed the way Fluent and Monitored LEP students are counted; the decrease in LEP student numbers reflects that change. Migrant student counts have been consistently decreasing in Utah.

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	54,619	33,361	61.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	773	262	33.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,190	1,018	46.5
Black, non-Hispanic	793	293	37.0
Hispanic	6,626	2,176	32.8
White, non-Hispanic	44,010	29,486	67.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,411	1,770	40.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,251	302	13.4
Economically disadvantaged students	13,861	6,305	45.5
Migratory students	109	22	20.2
Male	28,633	18,327	64.0
Female	25,986	15,034	57.8

Comments: 2008-09 EDEN file specifications resulted in more accurate counts.

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	986	820	83.2
Districts	107	93	86.9
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	246	214	87.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	193	168	87.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	53	46	86.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
70	59	84.3
Comments: This number is correct.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

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

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Key Components of the System of Support for LEAs Identified for Improvement: All districts identified for improvement must complete the district improvement plan and reserve 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development to address the reason(s) for which the LEA was identified in need of improvement. Districts in the first two years of LEA improvement are also strongly encouraged to use the appraisal system described below. There are three Districts identified for corrective action, that is, those districts that have been identified for improvement for three consecutive years, must use the appraisal system and support teams. Appraisal and Support Teams: Those districts identified for corrective action, and others that choose to do so, will engage in a district improvement process as outlined in the following steps: Step 1: Districts identified for corrective action are notified by the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). After verifying their status, districts are contacted by the USOE staff and asked to participate in the selection of a district consulting team from the USOE approved consulting organizations list. The district consulting teams will be comprised of at least three individuals with expertise in district improvement and in the areas in which the district was identified for improvement (i.e., reading/language arts, math, working with subpopulations). Step 2: The district consulting team is chosen from the list of USOE-approved consulting organizations and plans the appraisal calendar and tasks within 90 days of district identification for improvement. Step 3: The district prepares for an appraisal visit by January or February, using the checklist to gather information and helping the team to schedule all data collection events, such as interviews and focus groups. Step 4: The district consulting team conducts the appraisal in January or February by gathering information from district personnel, external stakeholders such as the Board, parents, community members, and selected school staff, and by collecting documentation. Data are used to provide ratings on the USOE district appraisal rubrics. The rubrics are based on the research on exemplary district practices to support student achievement. Step 5: The district consulting team prepares the district appraisal report and shares the report with the district leaders, staff, and others determined appropriate jointly with the district. Step 6: The district uses the information collected to decide whether to maintain, change, or enhance the composition of the district support team to help them to develop their revised district improvement plan. Step 7: The newly composed district support team works with the district to revise the district improvement plan. The plan is presented to the district board and the completed plan and signature pages are sent electronically to USOE Title I staff by March 31st. Step 8: The district support team works with the district to implement the improvement plan and monitor progress.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	5
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	5
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	3	3
Schools	40	39
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	9/11/09
---	---------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	4,038	3,912
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	2,345	2,261
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	58.1	57.8
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	4,051	3,906
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	2,579	2,296
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	63.7	58.8
Comments:		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	14
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	5
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	1
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		15	5	10	A	
2		15	5	10	A	
3		15	5	10	A	
4		15	5	10	A	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 1 Bi-annual Title I directors meeting sharing of best practices and strategies to disseminate to schools within their respective LEAs.
 - 2 On-site school visits to observe strategies and best practices as they were being implemented. USOE staff gave feedback and shared those strategies with other schools.
 - 3 School leadership trainings were held with their School Support Teams in attendance. USOE facilitated networking between the schools as they shared their strategies.
 - 4 USOE provided online information and tools to assist schools as they implemented their school improvement plans.
 - 5 USOE conducted intra-agency collaboration meetings with Title I, Curriculum, and Special Education. Each department disseminated the effective strategies with the administrators and teachers with whom they worked.
 - 6 USOE hired a parental involvement specialist to assist schools and districts with responsibilities for increasing parent involvement.
 - 7 USOE produced and provided for districts and schools a variety of parent information brochures designed to assist with effective communication between LEAs, schools, and parents and an understanding of Title I.
7. USOE provided technical assistance and review of parental involvement policies and compacts.

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

In partnership with the Southwest Comprehensive Center, the American Institutes of Research assisted the USOE in designing an evaluation of the state systems of support. The evaluation was designed and implemented during the 2008-09 school year. The information gained will assist USOE in revising and refining the current systems of support.

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

K-3 Literacy funds 4-6 Math grant Reading First Title III support funds Title VII support funds Math Core Academy Principal Literacy Academy Coaching Institutes Highly Impacted Schools (state grant) Optional Extended Day Kindergarten STAR Tutoring program Title II D Title II A Migrant Funds for Title I schools 21st Century Community Learning Centers Safe and Drug free school funds

All of the above funding streams allowed schools, including schools in improvement, receiving those funds to focus on student achievement in a very targeted manner and enhance the learning opportunities for students. These funds supported teachers with professional development, trained parents in tutoring so they could assist their students, and offered additional learning time for students through before and after school programs, summer schools, and optional extended day kindergarten classes. Administrators also received additional professional development through the Principal's Literacy Academy in order to be a more effective instructional leader. As a result of many of these efforts, 14 of the 15 schools identified for improvement in 2008-09 achieved AYP. Five of those schools exited improvement status.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	8,107
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	70

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 708

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	3,120
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	99
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 383,167
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	96,521	78,135	81.0	18,386	19.0
All elementary classes	13,668	12,364	90.5	1,304	9.5
All secondary classes	82,853	65,771	79.4	17,082	20.6

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

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

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah calculates HQ classes such that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	46.3
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	11.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	41.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	32.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	18.4
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	49.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	2,964	2,712	91.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,884	3,423	88.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	16,771	12,899	76.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	19,119	16,500	86.3

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	53.1	21.4
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment	
Secondary schools	43.3	20.1
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish, Navajo, Ute
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One-way immersion programs provided in Spanish, French, and Chinese.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	47,666
Comments: The ELL count is based on ELL student enrollment as of October 2008, but the UALPA testing window is in the spring. Because of the high mobility factor the number of students enrolled and /or tested may differ. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's ELL population.	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	47,160
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	39,482
Navajo; Navaho	1,037
Vietnamese	740
Tonga (Tonga Islands)	656
Samoan	565

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	43,453
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	491
Total	43,944
Comments: The ELL count is based on October student enrollment counts, but the UALPA testing window is in the spring. Because of the high mobility factor, the number of students enrolled and students tested may differ. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's ELL population.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	15,787
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	32.2
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	42,870
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	486
Total	43,356
Comments: The ELL count is based on ELL student enrollment as of October 2008, but the UALPA testing window is in the spring. Because of the high mobility factor the number of students enrolled and /or tested may differ. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's ELL population.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	13,718

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	12,329	27.6		32.50
ELP attainment	15,487	34.7		23.20
Comments: Utah's AMAO 2 targets now reflect a change where only students who received ELL services in the 2008-2009 academic year are included in the calculation.				

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,193	14,429	16,622
Comments: The USOE will audit these date and resubmit, if necessary.		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,597	4,274	64.8	2,323
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,158	6,056	84.6	1,102
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,461	3,018	55.3	2,443
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	31
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	22
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	24
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	30
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	29
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	2
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	2
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
7,477	7,434	31

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	331
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	59

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	31	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	31	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	31	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	31	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	31	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	13	500
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	15	30
PD provided to principals	4	6
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	10	10
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	133
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	5
Total	48	684

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	04/07/09	274
Comments:		

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

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

Beginning in 2009-2010, the USOE implemented a new web-based LEA consolidated application tool which will enhance the flow of funding. The Utah Consolidated Application (UCA) will replace the Consolidated Utah Student Achievement Plan (CUSAP). The funding distribution process will be shortened progressively as the new tool is phased in.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: The number of persistently dangerous schools in Utah is zero.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	87.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	73.4
Hispanic	69.1
White, non-Hispanic	90.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	80.1
Limited English proficient	65.3
Economically disadvantaged	77.6
Migratory students	49.4
Male	86.7
Female	88.9

Comments: Regarding the graduation rate for migratory students, the decrease from last program year to the current program year may be attributed to a number of reasons. One might be that the number of migratory students identified as "Out-of-School-Youth" (i.e., 18 yrs to 21yrs of age that have not graduated from high school) increased from 2 in the 2007/2008 program year to 17 students this program year. Other reasons are mostly anecdotal. The Utah Migrant Education Program, currently, has not conducted any quantitative research regarding the effects of the downturn in the economy on migrant students. However, preliminary surveys and informal conversations with farmworkers have revealed a need for all able family members to be working. This may have an impact on students' abilities to participate effectively enough in school to graduate.

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6.8
Hispanic	7.9
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.7
Limited English proficient	7.2
Economically disadvantaged	6.3
Migratory students	10.7
Male	4.1
Female	3.5
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	32	32
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	40	40
Comments: The number of LEAs does not reflect charter school enrollments. No charter schools have subgrants.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		
K	375	592
1	438	879
2	476	849
3	424	943
4	414	853
5	371	867
6	348	836
7	283	794
8	197	815
9	201	748
10	137	630
11	202	557
12	177	610
Ungraded		
Total	4,043	9,973
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	339	704
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,298	8,931
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	193	57
Hotels/Motels	213	281
Total	4,043	9,973
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	835
1	1,091
2	1,045
3	1,119
4	1,033
5	1,057
6	961
7	935
8	949
9	889
10	690
11	643
12	622
Ungraded	
Total	11,903
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	545
Migratory children/youth	210
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,988
Limited English proficient students	3,025
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	8
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	1
Transportation	8
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	770	461
4	697	393
5	715	379
6	678	393
7	624	360
8	642	386
High School	415	266
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	559	274
4	523	257
5	526	276
6	496	216
7	320	171
8	295	118
High School	215	74
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	226
K	216
1	160
2	145
3	159
4	110
5	137
6	100
7	104
8	98
9	101
10	85
11	76
12	56
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	15
Total	1,788
Comments: Utah has no ungraded migrant students.	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

A secondary reason for declining migrant populations in Utah could be that fewer areas once used for agricultural purposes are available: urban sprawl has eliminated crops and agricultural jobs.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	68
K	47
1	23
2	30
3	27
4	18
5	21
6	13
7	10
8	11
9	17
10	15
11	19
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	319
<p>Comments: Although Utah has not yet completed quantitative research to conclude why fewer migrant students are being identified, many conversations and Comprehensive Needs Assessment (C.N.A.) surveys have been done with migrant families and MEP, LEA ID&R recruiters and personnel. That qualitative data have lent substantial insight into reasons for declining migrant student populations. During the summer of 2007, a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.) incursion was conducted in one of the larger migrant employers in Utah. There have been continued negative outcomes of that activity in the migrant population. Their willingness to be forthcoming with sensitive personal information (i.e., National COE data) to Utah MEP personnel has been jeopardized and subsequently fewer migrant families were determined eligible for services. A secondary reason for declining migrant populations in Utah could be that fewer areas once used for agricultural purposes are available: urban sprawl has eliminated crops and agricultural jobs. Results of Comprehensive Needs Assessments have determined that in certain areas of Utah, qualifying migrant activities do not lend Summer Intersession Programs. These local Migrant Education Programs are turning their services to activities that occur during the regular education school year. For this reason, fewer migrant students are being identified as participating in Summer Migrant Education Programs.</p>	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

A secondary reason for declining migrant populations in Utah could be that fewer areas once used for agricultural purposes are available: urban sprawl has eliminated crops and agricultural jobs.

Some local MEPs have determined through Comprehensive Needs Assessments that some qualifying activities do not warrant Summer Migrant Programs, rather services during the regular school year when students are present.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: The system that Utah used for the 2008/2009 school year reporting period is the Migrant Achievement and Performance System (MAPS), www.ertcmeps.com.

2: The child counts for the last reporting period were generated using MAPS.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: Utah MEP child count data were collected by LEA MEP recruiters by way of paper copies of National Certificates of Eligibility (COEs). The National COEs are signed by parents/guardians and by the interviewer/recruiter. The COEs are then reviewed by LEA MEP Directors and approved. Once approved, COE data are entered by the LEA into the online MAPS data collection system, at which point the SEA/MEP Director reviews and approves or declines each COE that has been submitted. Each COE that is declined is returned electronically to the LEA for re-interview and re-submission of the COE.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data are inputted into the online MAPS system by LEA/MEP staff after the paper copies of National COEs have been submitted to LEA/MEP Directors for approval. LEA/MEP personnel input the student data and update changes in the MAPS system as needed. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of May (regular school year) each year and before the end of October (Summer Program, unduplicated count) each year. The MAPS system automatically organizes this information disaggregated by district as well as aggregated for the whole state MEP. Coordination with the Utah State Data Warehouse during the May and October uploads also facilitates this process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each child in the count is taken directly from the approved National COEs. Furthermore, the MAPS system automatically calculates (using the QAD) the exact number of students that were eligible within the last three years. Also using the QAD, the MAPS system calculates all students who were residents for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 to August 31st). The qualifying activity for each child's family is included on the approved National COE (which is maintained in the Utah MAPS system electronically).

LEAs/LOAs are required to enter on the electronic National COE each child age. LEAs/LOAs are also required to input into the MAPS system (for each child) any and all MEP services provided during summer, academic year, or intersession. Districts are also required to input each students current grade level in relation to each child count category. The MAPS system maintains all of this data and creates an end of year report including each of these topics.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2008/2009 program year, the Utah MEP conducted a Prospective Re-interview following the protocol as instructed in the Federal Regulations SEC. 200.89(b)(2).

A random sample of students was identified from each Utah migrant program districts using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The sampling was designed to ensure that at twenty families were identified from each of the Utah migrant districts to ensure that a minimum of six different families were re-interviewed from each of the 14 Utah local migrant programs. After discussion with the state director and the districts it was estimated that in order to identify any problems or issues with identification and recruitment in a district a minimum of six families needed to be re-interviewed in each program. Twenty families were randomly selected from each district as an oversample based on the assumption that the auditor would have a 30% contact rate in order to successfully contact six families per district. This percentage is based on previous years contact rate in Utah with re-interview process by ERTC. It was also understood that in some of the smallest local programs the auditor may not be able to successfully find six families. In which case the interviewer was given all the COEs from those districts and required to contact each family a minimum of three times. As a result in some circumstances there were less than six families interviewed in the smallest districts. There were also a few districts which had yet to receive approval for any COEs in 2008-2009, these districts had zero contacts.

The interviewer from Educational Research and Training Corporation (ERTC) was then asked to construct an interviewing schedule using the sample. The interviewer (Mr. Mel Valdez) was provided copies of the COEs from the sample and contact names in each district by the state migrant director to assist them in locating families of students within the sample. The interviewing schedule was discussed with the project coordinator as well as the state migrant director. The re-interviewing process began in May 2009 and was completed by June 15, 2009.

In its most direct form, the analysis for this project is fairly straight forward. The interviewer indicated on the interview protocol any possible questions regarding the accuracy of the recruiter and any questions regarding student eligibility. The interviewer used the OME guidance from 2003 to ascertain student eligibility depending on the date of initial qualification. The project coordinator then reviewed all the results

of the written interview protocols in relation to the original Certificates of Eligibility from 2008-2009. The project coordinator then supported or contested the audit interviewer's assessment. Finally, the Utah State Migrant Director reviewed the forms and the findings so that an agreement by three distinct reviewers facilitated the validity of the process. In addition, each of the reviewers was asked to identify any other issues (e.g. intentional fraud, high defect rates from certain recruiters, etc.) that were of importance to note and help to further clarify recruitment identification and eligibility issues for the state of Utah. A record of each interview protocol, the independent judgments and comments of each reviewer (i.e., audit interviewers, project coordinator, and state director) is available and will be maintained for review at the Utah Department of Education. There were no discrepancies found during the review process (i.e. the audit interviewer, the project coordinator, and the state migrant director all agreed on recruitment issues).

The Utah audit assessment of recruiter effectiveness was completed over the agreed upon contract period by Educational Research and Training Corporation. It was clear that there were fewer issues in 2008-2009 in recruiting than in previous years that need to be addressed as part of a training program for local district recruiters. A few of the most common recruiter errors were: qualifying person on COE conflict--different name on COE; students being re-enrolled in the program that had not made qualifying moves, families doing non-qualifying work, out of date qualifying arrival dates, and families that were settled out and had lived in respective communities as permanent residents. Most of the mistakes made by recruiters on the COEs did not result in the ineligibility of the students in those families.

Of the fifty-five families interviewed in the sample only four were ineligible for services (7.3%). There were 153 students within the fifty-five families and 143 of the 153 were eligible (only 10 students or 6.5% were not eligible).

Recommendations

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Results from the 2008/2009 Prospective Re-interview conducting during the were shared with each participating LEA/LOA in a unique report and in conjunction with a Utah State MEP LEA/LOA Directors' meeting.

Where ineligibility determinations were encountered, LEA/LOAs are required to demonstrate how those students were taken off Migrant Education Program rolls. Also, LEA/LOAs are required to define corrective actions to eliminated future occurrences of similar problems and recruiting mistakes in their individual LEA/LOAs . The SEA will continue to conduct Identification and Recruitment training sessions to define specific areas to be improved and methods and procedures to improve them.

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

Utah has no concerns at this time.