

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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date:
10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2008-09 X 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

Friday, April 23, 2010, 11:01:54 AM

Signature Date

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring At or Above Proficient | Percentage At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 10,708 | 6,643 | 62.0 |
| 4 | 10,509 | 6,805 | 64.8 |
| 5 | 10,077 | 6,647 | 66.0 |
| 6 | 6,980 | 3,982 | 57.0 |
| 7 | 1,747 | 886 | 50.7 |
| 8 | 1,452 | 457 | 31.5 |
| High School | 262 | 63 | 24.0 |
| Total | 41,735 | 25,483 | 61.1 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring At or Above Proficient | Percentage At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 10,722 | 7,736 | 72.2 |
| 4 | 10,518 | 7,389 | 70.2 |
| 5 | 10,097 | 6,856 | 67.9 |
| 6 | 6,982 | 4,843 | 69.4 |
| 7 | 1,836 | 1,164 | 63.4 |
| 8 | 1,749 | 1,096 | 62.7 |
| High School | 341 | 232 | 68.0 |
| Total | 42,245 | 29,316 | 69.4 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring At or Above Proficient | Percentage At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 3,154 | 2,317 | 73.5 |
| 4 | 3,272 | 2,563 | 78.3 |
| 5 | 3,192 | 2,457 | 77.0 |
| 6 | 1,809 | 1,299 | 71.8 |
| 7 | 766 | 597 | 77.9 |
| 8 | 561 | 324 | 57.8 |
| High School | 343 | 133 | 38.8 |
| Total | 13,097 | 9,690 | 74.0 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring At or Above Proficient | Percentage At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 3,157 | 2,606 | 82.6 |
| 4 | 3,277 | 2,696 | 82.3 |
| 5 | 3,195 | 2,573 | 80.5 |
| 6 | 1,813 | 1,510 | 83.3 |
| 7 | 774 | 686 | 88.6 |
| 8 | 678 | 578 | 85.2 |
| High School | 638 | 570 | 89.3 |
| Total | 13,532 | 11,219 | 82.9 |
| Comments: | | | |

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

| | # Students Served |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 14,486 |
| Limited English proficient students | 22,431 |
| Students who are homeless | 5,376 |
| Migratory students | 914 |
| Comments: . | |

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

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

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

| Race/Ethnicity | # Students Served |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4,111 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 4,181 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 2,577 |
| Hispanic | 32,257 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61,379 |
| Total | 104,505 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| Age/Grade | Public TAS | Public SWP | Private | Local Neglected | Total |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Age 0-2 | | | | | |
| Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten) | 253 | 2,691 | | | 2,944 |
| K | 3,524 | 14,006 | | | 17,530 |
| 1 | 3,705 | 13,433 | | | 17,138 |
| 2 | 3,540 | 12,851 | | | 16,391 |
| 3 | 3,645 | 12,272 | | | 15,917 |
| 4 | 3,749 | 11,950 | | | 15,699 |
| 5 | 3,697 | 11,528 | | | 15,225 |
| 6 | 2,214 | 7,820 | | | 10,034 |
| 7 | 1,009 | 2,197 | | | 3,206 |
| 8 | 859 | 2,107 | | | 2,966 |
| 9 | 1,026 | 1,356 | | | 2,382 |
| 10 | 857 | 518 | | | 1,375 |
| 11 | 960 | 699 | | | 1,659 |
| 12 | 717 | 655 | | | 1,372 |
| Ungraded | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 29,755 | 94,083 | | | 123,838 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

| | # Students Served |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Mathematics | 99 |
| Reading/language arts | 104 |
| Science | N<10 |
| Social studies | N<10 |
| Vocational/career | N<10 |
| Other instructional services | N<10 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| | # Students Served |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Health, dental, and eye care | N<10 |
| Supporting guidance/advocacy | N<10 |
| Other support services | N<10 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

| Staff Category | Staff FTE | Percentage Qualified |
|---|-----------|----------------------|
| Teachers | 9 | |
| Paraprofessionals ¹ | 46 | 100.0 |
| Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ² | 0 | |
| Clerical support staff | 0 | |
| Administrators (non-clerical) | 3 | |
| Comments: | | |

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

| | Paraprofessionals FTE | Percentage Qualified |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Paraprofessionals ³ | 399.00 | 98.0 |
| Comments: | | |

³ Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants | 2 |
| Comments: | |

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

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

| | # Participants |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Families participating | 55 |
| 2. Adults participating | 59 |
| 3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners) | 34 |
| 4. Participating children | 108 |
| a. Birth through 2 years | 39 |
| b. Ages 3 through 5 | 29 |
| c. Ages 6 through 8 | 19 |
| c. Above age 8 | 21 |
| Comments: | |

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

| | # |
|---|----|
| 1. Number of newly enrolled families | 23 |
| 2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants | 25 |
| 3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment | 23 |
| 4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment | 25 |
| 5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment | 14 |
| Comments: | |

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

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

| Time in Program | # |
|--|----------|
| 1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less | 7 |
| 2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days | 9 |
| 3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days | 13 |
| 4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more | 26 |
| 5. Total families enrolled | 55 |
| Comments: | |

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

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined at the State level either by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance Indicators.

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

| | # Pre-and Post-Tested | # Who Met Goal | Explanation (if applicable) |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|
| TABE | 13 | N<10 | Expectation is 80% of adults after 60-80 hours of instruction will advance to the next level. Utah defines significant learning as one level (advancing to the next level). 2008-9 results: 46% adults made significant learning gains. |
| CASAS | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

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

| | # Pre-and Post-Tested | # Who Met Goal | Explanation (if applicable) |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|
| TABE | | | |
| CASAS | 12 | N<10 | Utah's expectation is 80% after 60-80 hours of instruction will advance to the next level. 2008-9 results: 48% of adults made significant learning gains on Best Literacy or CASAS Reading. |
| BEST | 13 | N<10 | |
| BEST Plus | 13 | 12 | |
| BEST Literacy | 13 | N<10 | |
| Other | 11 | N<10 | CASAS Listening. |
| Comments: | | | |

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

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

| School-Age Adults | # with goal | # Who Met Goal | Explanation (if applicable) |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| Diploma | N<10 | N<10 | Utah's expectation is that 100% of school age participants who have a diploma as a goal will receive a diploma by the end of the school year. 2008-9 results: 100% met the goal and indicator was met. |
| GED | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Comments: | | | |

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

| Non-School-Age Adults | # with goal | # Who Met Goal | Explanation (if applicable) |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------|---|
| Diploma | N<10 | N<10 | Utah's expectation is 100% of non-school age adult participants who have as a goal will receive a diploma by the end of the program year. 2008-9 results: 100% met the goal and indicator was met. |
| GED | N<10 | N<10 | Utah's expectation is that 100% of non-school age adult participants who have a GED as a goal will take and pass one or more sections of the GED or receive a GED by the end of the program year. 2008-9 results: 100% met the GED goal. Indicator was met. |
| Other | | | |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

| | # Age-Eligible | # Pre-and Post-Tested | # Who Met Goal | # Exempted | Explanation (if applicable) |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------|---|
| PPVT-III | 12 | 12 | 11 | | Utah's expectation is that 75% of the children entering Kindergarten demonstrate learning gains by achieving a standard score improved by 4 or more on the PPVT-III. In 2008-9, the indicator was met as 92% had an increase of 4 or more points. |
| PPVT-IV | | | | | |
| TVIP | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

| | # Age-Eligible | # Tested | # Who Met Goal | # Exempted | Explanation (if applicable) |
|------------------|----------------|----------|----------------|------------|---|
| PPVT-III | 12 | 12 | N<10 | | In 2008-9, 75% of the children age-eligible for kindergarten had a standard score of 85% or higher on the PPVT-III. |
| PPVTIV | | | | | |
| TVIP | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

| | # Age-Eligible | # Tested | # Exempted | Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average) | Explanation (if applicable) |
|----------------------|----------------|----------|------------|--|-----------------------------|
| PALS PreK Upper Case | 12 | 12 | | 17.4 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

| Grade | # In Cohort | # Who Met Goal | Explanation (include source of data) |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| K | N<10 | N<10 | 29% on Dibels |
| 1 | N<10 | N<10 | 86% on Dibels |
| 2 | N<10 | N<10 | 60% on Dibels |
| 3 | N<10 | N<10 | 44% on Dibels |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

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

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

| | # In Cohort | # Who Met Goal | Explanation (if applicable) |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|
| PEP Scale I | 34 | 28 | Utah's expectation is 50% of parent participants who after their pre-assessment have been in the program for six months or more will demonstrate a .3 gain as measured on the PEP. |
| PEP Scale II | 34 | 28 | |
| PEP Scale III | 34 | 27 | |
| PEP Scale IV | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migrant Children |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | N<10 |
| 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 | 1,791 |

Comments:

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 94 |
| K | 14 |
| 1 | 14 |
| 2 | 19 |
| 3 | 28 |
| 4 | 16 |
| 5 | 14 |
| 6 | 15 |
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 246 |

Comments: In May of 2009, the Office of Migrant Education (OME) conducted a program compliance monitoring visit in Utah. One of the items that was reviewed was the Utah Migrant Education Sub-grant Funding Formula. One of the issues considered to be in need of change was Factor 2 of the funding formula, or "Priority For Service". During the remainder of May, June, July and August of 2009, the Priority For Service determinations were determined and reported differently than in past program years which has lead to some inconsistencies in this particular reporting section of the CSPR. Another reason is the refinement of the Utah Migrant Education data collection system, known as "MAPS". The 2008/2009 Migrant Education program year is the first year that all possible data be extracted from the Utah Data Warehouse. The category "Priority For Service" is one that must be reported directly from the LEAs as it is not a specific indicator in the Utah Data Warehouse. Matched with the change in the Priority For Service definition, many students simply were not re-reported through the MAPS data system and therefore, not recorded in the Utah Data Warehouse, or were taken out of report because their prior determination was no longer accurate. This is an issue which will be corrected in the future.

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

| Age/Grade | Limited English Proficient (LEP) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 37 |
| K | 169 |
| 1 | 144 |
| 2 | 131 |
| 3 | 145 |
| 4 | 103 |
| 5 | 118 |
| 6 | 90 |
| 7 | 88 |
| 8 | 77 |
| 9 | 76 |
| 10 | 74 |
| 11 | 54 |
| 12 | 38 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 1,348 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

| Age/Grade | Children with Disabilities (IDEA) |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 22 |
| K | 12 |
| 1 | 18 |
| 2 | 28 |
| 3 | 20 |
| 4 | 12 |
| 5 | 33 |
| 6 | 19 |
| 7 | 21 |
| 8 | 16 |
| 9 | 13 |
| 10 | 10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 238 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | 12 Months | Previous 13 – 24 Months | Previous 25 – 36 Months | Previous 37 – 48 Months |
| Age birth through 2 | N<10 | N<10 | N<10 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 61 | 70 | 50 | |
| K | 38 | 60 | 71 | |
| 1 | 28 | 39 | 49 | |
| 2 | 30 | 38 | 37 | |
| 3 | 34 | 40 | 38 | |
| 4 | 24 | 29 | 30 | |
| 5 | 22 | 37 | 42 | |
| 6 | 19 | 25 | 25 | |
| 7 | 14 | 25 | 29 | |
| 8 | 10 | 28 | 31 | |
| 9 | N<10 | 27 | 28 | |
| 10 | N<10 | 27 | 23 | |
| 11 | 11 | 22 | 19 | |
| 12 | N<10 | 11 | 15 | |
| Ungraded | | | | |
| Out-of-school | N<10 | N<10 | N<10 | |
| Total | 313 | 481 | 492 | |
| <p>Comments: The current lack of National Immigration policy paired with MEP eligibility definitions, identifying and recruiting students to the Utah MEP has become more difficult. Recruiters report that families are resistant to questions and many times avoid the outreach workers altogether. Therefore, those students who have recently arrived in local programs are much more likely to not be identified as eligible for the Utah MEP; their families are simply more likely to avoid MEP recruiters and/or refuse to be interviewed.</p> | | | | |

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | Move During Regular School Year |
|--|--|
| Age birth through 2 | N<10 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 131 |
| K | 114 |
| 1 | 83 |
| 2 | 80 |
| 3 | 81 |
| 4 | 60 |
| 5 | 67 |
| 6 | 49 |
| 7 | 50 |
| 8 | 50 |
| 9 | 36 |
| 10 | 40 |
| 11 | 39 |
| 12 | 18 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 906 |
| Comments: There were fewer students reported during this program year than last. New MEP eligibility definitions and lack of National Immigration policy have created an environment where students and their families are much more likely to avoid or refuse interviews with MEP outreach workers and recruiters. | |

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

| Grade | Dropped Out |
|----------|-------------|
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | 23 |

Comments: There are fewer eligible migrant students this MEP program year and last year. Either there are fewer eligible migrant students in this category or many students in this age range have "settled-out" of the Utah MEP. Utah does not use the ungraded category in data submission. There were no 8th grade drop out students in 2008-09.

FAQ on Dropouts:

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

2.3.2.2 GED

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Obtained a GED in your state | 0 |
| Comments: | |

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

| Grade | Enrolled | Tested |
|-------|----------|--------|
| 3 | 151 | 142 |
| 4 | 102 | 96 |
| 5 | 133 | 125 |
| 6 | 96 | 91 |
| 7 | 97 | 89 |
| 8 | 95 | 90 |
| 9 | 95 | 95 |
| 10 | 77 | 75 |
| 11 | 69 | 65 |
| 12 | 35 | 34 |
| Total | 950 | 902 |

Comments: There were fewer students reported during this program year than last. New MEP eligibility definitions and lack of National Immigration policy have created an environment where students and their families are much more likely to avoid or refuse interviews with MEP outreach workers and recruiters.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

| Grade | Enrolled | Tested |
|-------|----------|--------|
| 3 | 152 | 148 |
| 4 | 102 | 101 |
| 5 | 133 | 129 |
| 6 | 96 | 95 |
| 7 | 96 | 91 |
| 8 | 93 | 87 |
| 9 | 55 | 54 |
| 10 | 72 | 63 |
| 11 | 57 | 53 |
| 12 | 29 | 27 |
| Total | 885 | 848 |

Comments: There were fewer students reported during this program year than last. New MEP eligibility definitions and lack of National Immigration policy have created an environment where students and their families are much more likely to avoid or refuse interviews with MEP outreach workers and recruiters.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

| Age/Grade | Served During Regular School Year |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 |
| K | 76 |
| 1 | 63 |
| 2 | 53 |
| 3 | 63 |
| 4 | 43 |
| 5 | 57 |
| 6 | 37 |
| 7 | 28 |
| 8 | 42 |
| 9 | 44 |
| 10 | 27 |
| 11 | 37 |
| 12 | 23 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 600 |
| <p>Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students during this MEP program year and last year. Also, a few local programs have determined that the most effective use of their funds should be used for a Summer MEP and therefore, fewer students are being reported as receiving services during the regular school year.</p> | |

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services |
|---|------------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 | N<10 |
| K | N<10 |
| 1 | N<10 |
| 2 | N<10 |
| 3 | 11 |
| 4 | N<10 |
| 5 | N<10 |
| 6 | N<10 |
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 56 |
| <p>Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. A few local MEPs have determined that the most effective use of their funds is to conduct larger Summer MEPs and therefore, fewer students over all were reported as receiving services during the regular school year.</p> | |

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

| Age/Grade | Continuation of Services |
|--|--------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | |
| K | N<10 |
| 1 | |
| 2 | N<10 |
| 3 | N<10 |
| 4 | N<10 |
| 5 | N<10 |
| 6 | N<10 |
| 7 | |
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 12 |
| Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. A few local MEPs have determined that the most effective use of their funds is to conduct larger Summer MEPs and therefore, fewer students over all were reported as receiving services during the regular school year. | |

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

| Age/Grade | Children Receiving an Instructional Service |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | |
| K | 61 |
| 1 | 53 |
| 2 | 49 |
| 3 | 50 |
| 4 | 37 |
| 5 | 49 |
| 6 | 32 |
| 7 | 25 |
| 8 | 33 |
| 9 | 40 |
| 10 | 20 |
| 11 | 33 |
| 12 | 21 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 503 |

Comments: A few local MEPs have determined that the most effective use of their funds is to conduct larger Summer MEPs and therefore, fewer students over all were reported as receiving services during the regular school year.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

| Age/Grade | Reading Instruction | Mathematics Instruction | High School Credit Accrual |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | | | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 | N<10 | |
| K | 67 | 64 | |
| 1 | 61 | 59 | |
| 2 | 52 | 51 | |
| 3 | 60 | 57 | |
| 4 | 39 | 39 | |
| 5 | 50 | 50 | |
| 6 | 34 | 33 | |
| 7 | 26 | 26 | |
| 8 | 38 | 38 | |
| 9 | 40 | 40 | N<10 |
| 10 | 21 | 21 | N<10 |
| 11 | 30 | 30 | N<10 |
| 12 | 21 | 21 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | | | |
| Out-of-school | | | |
| Total | 540 | 530 | 16 |

Comments: A few local MEPs have determined that the most effective use of their funds is to conduct larger Summer MEPs and therefore, fewer students over all were reported as receiving services during the regular school year.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

| Age/Grade | Children Receiving Support Services | Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| Age birth through 2 | | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 | |
| K | N<10 | |
| 1 | N<10 | |
| 2 | N<10 | |
| 3 | N<10 | N<10 |
| 4 | N<10 | |
| 5 | N<10 | N<10 |
| 6 | N<10 | |
| 7 | N<10 | N<10 |
| 8 | N<10 | |
| 9 | 15 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 | N<10 |
| 12 | N<10 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | | |
| Out-of-school | | N<10 |
| Total | 91 | 12 |
| Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. A few local MEPs have determined that the most effective use of their funds is to conduct larger Summer MEPs and therefore, fewer students over all were reported as receiving services during the regular school year. | | |

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

| Age/Grade | Referred Service |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 |
| K | N<10 |
| 1 | N<10 |
| 2 | N<10 |
| 3 | N<10 |
| 4 | N<10 |
| 5 | N<10 |
| 6 | N<10 |
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 45 |

Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. A few local MEPs have determined that the most effective use of their funds is to conduct larger Summer MEPs and therefore, fewer students over all were reported as receiving services during the regular school year.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Served During Summer/Intersession Term |
|--|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 70 |
| K | 48 |
| 1 | 23 |
| 2 | 30 |
| 3 | 27 |
| 4 | 18 |
| 5 | 22 |
| 6 | 13 |
| 7 | 12 |
| 8 | 12 |
| 9 | 17 |
| 10 | 15 |
| 11 | 20 |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 327 |
| Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. | |

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 | 70 |
| K | 14 |
| 1 | N<10 |
| 2 | N<10 |
| 3 | N<10 |
| 4 | |
| 5 | N<10 |
| 6 | N<10 |
| 7 | |

| | |
|---------------|------|
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 99 |

Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. In May of 2009, the Office of Migrant Education (OME) conducted a program compliance monitoring visit in Utah. One of the items that was reviewed was the Utah Migrant Education Sub-grant Funding Formula. One of the issues considered to be in need of change was Factor 2 of the funding formula, or "Priority For Service". During the remainder of May, June, July and August of 2009, the Priority For Service determinations were determined and reported differently than in past program years which has led to some inconsistencies in this particular reporting section of the CSPR. Another reason is the refinement of the Utah Migrant Education data collection system, known as "MAPS". The 2008/2009 Migrant Education program year is the first year that all possible data be extracted from the Utah Data Warehouse. The category "Priority For Service" is one that must be reported directly from the LEAs as it is not a specific indicator in the Utah Data Warehouse. Matched with the change in the Priority For Service definition, many students simply were not re-reported through the MAPS data system and therefore, not recorded in the Utah Data Warehouse, or were taken out of report because their prior determination was no longer accurate. This is an issue which will be corrected in the future.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Continuation of Services |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | |
| K | |
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | |

Comments: There were fewer eligible migrant students reported during this program year than last. None of the local Summer MEPs determined that "continuation of services" as a priority and therefore none of these types of services were reported.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Children Receiving an Instructional Service |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 56 |
| K | 42 |
| 1 | 20 |
| 2 | 29 |
| 3 | 25 |
| 4 | 16 |
| 5 | 18 |
| 6 | 11 |
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | 16 |
| 10 | 15 |
| 11 | 18 |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 283 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

| Age/Grade | Reading Instruction | Mathematics Instruction | High School Credit Accrual |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | | | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 67 | 67 | |
| K | 47 | 47 | |
| 1 | 23 | 23 | |
| 2 | 30 | 30 | |
| 3 | 27 | 27 | |
| 4 | 18 | 18 | |
| 5 | 21 | 21 | |
| 6 | 13 | 13 | |
| 7 | 10 | 10 | |
| 8 | 11 | 11 | |
| 9 | 17 | 17 | N<10 |
| 10 | 15 | 15 | N<10 |
| 11 | 19 | 19 | N<10 |
| 12 | | | |
| Ungraded | | | |
| Out-of-school | | | |
| Total | 318 | 318 | 20 |

Comments: A few of the local programs have decided to focus their services on Summer Intersession programs. Therefore, the numbers during this program period for this section might be inflated. In areas where the numbers are less this program year than last is due mostly to the fact that fewer migrant students were reported during this program year than last.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

| Age/Grade | Children Receiving Support Services | Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| Age birth through 2 | | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 | |
| K | N<10 | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | N<10 | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | N<10 |
| 12 | | |
| Ungraded | | |
| Out-of-school | | |
| Total | N<10 | N<10 |
| <p>Comments: Overall, there were fewer students reported during this program year than last. Also, this type of service may not have been necessary for the academic achievement for the students participating in the MEP during the summer intersession and therefore, fewer were reported as receiving them.</p> | | |

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Referred Service |
|--|-------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 11 |
| K | N<10 |
| 1 | N<10 |
| 2 | N<10 |
| 3 | N<10 |
| 4 | N<10 |
| 5 | N<10 |
| 6 | N<10 |
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | N<10 |
| 9 | |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 33 |
| <p>Comments: Overall, there were fewer students reported during this program year than last. Also, this type of service may not have been necessary for the academic achievement for the students participating in the MEP during the summer intersession and therefore, fewer were reported as receiving them.</p> | |

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

| Age/Grade | Served During the Program Year |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | N<10 |
| 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 | 100 |
| 10 | 85 |
| 11 | 76 |
| 12 | 56 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | 15 |
| Total | 1,790 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

| | # |
|---|-------|
| Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children | 172 |
| Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools | 1,918 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

| | # |
|---|---|
| Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program | |
| Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools | |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

| Type of MEP Project | Number of MEP Projects | Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Regular school year – school day only | 162 | 1,781 |
| Regular school year – school day/extended day | 0 | |
| Summer/intersession only | 22 | 964 |
| Year round | 54 | 826 |
| Comments: A number of local programs have been using funds to supplement regular day school activities instead of maintaining Migrant Education only projects. They have, therefore reported more projects because they are providing resources to more schools. | | |

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| State Director FTE | 0.75 |
| Comments: | |

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

| Job Classification | Regular School Year | | Summer/Interession Term | |
|--|---------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
| | Headcount | FTE | Headcount | FTE |
| Teachers | 10 | 3.50 | 108 | 95.50 |
| Counselors | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| All paraprofessionals | 42 | 15.10 | 65 | 51.90 |
| Recruiters | 16 | 9.70 | 9 | 8.40 |
| Records transfer staff | 2 | 0.60 | 2 | 1.00 |
| Comments: There were fewer students reported during this program year than last, therefore fewer staff are required. Also, some migrant programs focused on summer programs this year and those changes are reflected in the FTE numbers. | | | | |

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

| | Regular School Year | | Summer/Intersession Term | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| | Headcount | FTE | Headcount | FTE |
| Qualified paraprofessionals | 37 | 12.10 | 63 | 51.60 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

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

| State Program/Facility Type | # Programs/Facilities | Average Length of Stay in Days |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Neglected programs | 8 | 113 |
| Juvenile detention | 6 | 10 |
| Juvenile corrections | 10 | 134 |
| Adult corrections | 2 | 283 |
| Other | 5 | 165 |
| Total | 31 | |

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

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

| | |
|--|----------|
| | # |
| Programs in a multiple purpose facility | 0 |
| Comments: | |

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

| State Program/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Neglected Programs | 8 |
| Juvenile Detention | 6 |
| Juvenile Corrections | 10 |
| Adult Corrections | 2 |
| Other | 5 |
| Total | 31 |
| Comments: | |

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

| # of Students Served | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | 624 | 2,127 | 507 | 127 | 406 |
| Long Term Students Served | 363 | 1,803 | 301 | 127 | 199 |

| Race/Ethnicity | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 31 | 68 | 16 | N<10 | 16 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 13 | 93 | 15 | N<10 | N<10 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 33 | 112 | 12 | N<10 | 35 |
| Hispanic | 96 | 628 | 86 | 52 | 65 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 378 | 1,219 | 217 | 58 | 252 |
| Total | 551 | 2,120 | 346 | 127 | 375 |

| Sex | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Male | 455 | 1,633 | 480 | 111 | 255 |
| Female | 169 | 494 | 27 | 16 | 151 |
| Total | 624 | 2,127 | 507 | 127 | 406 |

| Age | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 3 through 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | N<10 | 12 | | | |
| 11 | 18 | 12 | | | |
| 12 | 16 | 21 | N<10 | | |
| 13 | 28 | 112 | N<10 | | N<10 |
| 14 | 95 | 614 | 45 | | 29 |
| 15 | 76 | 490 | 74 | | 122 |
| 16 | 188 | 465 | 132 | | 73 |
| 17 | 140 | 297 | 191 | N<10 | 103 |
| 18 | 53 | 84 | 32 | N<10 | 56 |
| 19 | N<10 | 10 | 25 | 19 | N<10 |
| 20 | | N<10 | | 44 | N<10 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 21 | | N<10 | | 57 | N<10 |
| Total | 624 | 2,127 | 507 | 127 | 406 |

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The discrepancy between the numbers is due to some programs submitting some students with an "Unspecified" race/ethnicity.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

| # Programs That | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities | Adult Corrections Facilities | Other Programs |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Awarded high school course credit(s) | 6 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Awarded high school diploma(s) | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Awarded GED(s) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

| # of Students Who | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities | Adult Corrections Facilities | Other Programs |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Earned high school course credits | 593 | 2,432 | 120 | 256 |
| Enrolled in a GED program | 11 | N<10 | 33 | N<10 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency

program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

| # of Students Who | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Enrolled in their local district school | 63 | 379 | N<10 | 115 |
| Earned a GED | N<10 | N<10 | 16 | N<10 |
| Obtained high school diploma | 42 | 63 | 25 | 39 |
| Were accepted into post-secondary education | 14 | 14 | N<10 | 22 |
| Enrolled in post-secondary education | 14 | 14 | N<10 | 16 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

| # of Students Who | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|--------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|
| Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs | 331 | 1,935 | 16 | 148 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

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

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

| # of Students Who | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|--------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|
| Enrolled in external job training education | 31 | N<10 | N<10 | N<10 |
| Obtained employment | 22 | 22 | N<10 | 26 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry | 358 | 252 | 119 | 35 |
| Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data) | 229 | 144 | 39 | 23 |

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 17 | 22 | N<10 |
| No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 92 | 25 | N<10 |
| Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | 19 | 48 | 117 | N<10 |
| Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 24 | 36 | 18 |
| Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 43 | 25 | N<10 |
| Comments: The length of stay of the non-reported long-term students was insufficient to provide valid/reliable assessed outcomes. | | | | |

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry | 279 | 267 | 120 | 37 |
| Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data) | 182 | 145 | 48 | 21 |

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 17 | 23 | N<10 |
| No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | 20 | 83 | 20 | N<10 |
| Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 55 | 70 | N<10 |
| Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 17 | 34 | 13 |
| Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | N<10 | 45 | 35 | N<10 |
| Comments: The length of stay of the non-reported long-term students was insufficient to provide valid/reliable assessed outcomes. | | | | |

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

| | |
|---|----------|
| | # |
| Programs in a multiple purpose facility | |
| Comments: Utah does not receive Subpart 2 funds. | |

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

| LEA Program/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|---|-------------------------|
| At-risk programs | |
| Neglected programs | |
| Juvenile detention | |
| Juvenile corrections | |
| Other | |
| Total | |
| Comments: Utah does not receive Subpart 2 funds. | |

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

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments: Utah does not receive Subpart 2 funds.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count: FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

| LEA Programs That | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention/ Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Awarded high school course credit(s) | | | | |
| Awarded high school diploma(s) | | | | |
| Awarded GED(s) | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

| # of Students Who | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Other Programs |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Earned high school course credits | | | | |
| Enrolled in a GED program | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

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

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

| # of Students Who | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Enrolled in their local district school | | | | |
| Earned a GED | | | | |
| Obtained high school diploma | | | | |
| Were accepted into post-secondary education | | | | |
| Enrolled in post-secondary education | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

| # of Students Who | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Other Programs |
|--|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

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

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

| # of Students Who | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Enrolled in external job training education | | | | |
| Obtained employment | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

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

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Other Programs |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Comments: Utah does not receive Subpart 2 funds. | | | | |

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

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

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Corrections/ Detention | Other Programs |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

| Performance Indicator | Instrument/ Data Source | Frequency of Collection | Year of most recent collection | Targets | Actual Performance | Baseline | Year Baseline Established |
|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| Decrease or hold steady the number of "persistently dangerous schools" as defined by Board Rule R277-483. "Persistently Dangerous Schools." | Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Effectiveness Report | Annually | 2008-2009 | 2006-07: 2006-2007 High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 | 2006-07: 2006-2007 High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 | High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 | 2003 |
| | | | | 2007-08: 2007-08: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 | | | |
| | | | | 2008-09: 2008-09: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Comments: The Utah State Office of Education continues to work with districts to ensure that keeping schools safe and

| Performance Indicator | Instrument/ Data Source | Frequency of Collection | Year of most recent collection | Targets | Actual Performance | Baseline | Year Baseline Established |
|---|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Favorable Attitudes to Antisocial Behaviors" | Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison | Biennially | 2009 | 2006-07: 2006-07: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1% | 2006-07: 2006-07 Grade 28.9%, 8th Grade 27.6%, 10th Grade 37.1%, 12th | 6th Grade 30.5% 8th Grade 25.4% 10th Grade 35.3% 12th Grade 36.1% | 2003 |
| | | | | 2007-08: 2007-2008 The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring. | | | |
| | | | | 2008-09: Grade 6th 28.8%, 8th Grade 26.6%, 10th Grade 36.5%, 12th 39.6% | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Comments: SHARP PNA Survey Changes for 2007 For each of the risk and protective factors scales, there is a value (a cutpoint) that determines whether students' responses to the scale questions place them at risk of engaging in problem behaviors or provides them with protection from engaging in

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

We completed the 2009 survey and the results are shown. Progress in each of the grades you will notice continues moving in the right direction with the exception of our 12th grade class which has now left the system.

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

| Performance Indicator | Instrument/ Data Source | Frequency of Collection | Year of most recent collection | Targets | Actual Performance | Baseline | Year Baseline Established |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------|---------------------------|
| | | | | 2006-07: 6th Grade 20.0%, 8th Grade 11.8%, 10th Grade 15.4%, 12th Grade 11.0% | 2006-07: 6th Grade 20.3%, 8th Grade 13.4%, 10th Grade 18.7%, 12th Grade 19.2% | | |
| | | | | 2007-08: The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring. | | 6th Grade | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | 2008-09: 6th Grade 21.8% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 19.0% 12th Grade 21.8 % | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|------|---|--|--|------|
| Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Intentions to use ATODs" | Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison | Biennially | 2009 | Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2% | | 23.0% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 16.4% 12th Grade 12.0% | 2003 |
|---|---|------------|------|---|--|--|------|

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | 2006-07: 6th Grade 17.5%, 8th Grade 18.2%, 10th Grade 15.8%, 12th Grade 21.6% | 2006-07: 6th Grade 31.1%, 8th Grade 22.6%, 10th Grade 29.1%, 12th Grade 22.6% | |
| | | | | 2007-08: 2007-08: The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring. | | |
| | | | | 2008-09: 6th Grade 33.1%, 8th Grade 24.2%, 10th Grade 30.4%, 12th Grade 27.5% | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------|---|---|------|
| Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Perceived risk of Drug Use" | Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison | Biennially | 2009 | 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6% | 6th Grade 19.5% 8th Grade 20.2% 10th Grade 16.8% 12th Grade 23.6% | 2003 |
| | | | | | | |

Comments: SHARP PNA Survey Changes for 2007 For each of the risk and protective factors scales, there is a value (a cutpoint) that determines whether students' responses to the scale questions place them at risk of engaging in problem behaviors or provides them with protection from engaging in problem behaviors. For each school, school district, Local Substance Abuse Authority, and the State of Utah, the results are presented as the percentage of students at risk and the percentage of students with protection for each of the risk and protective factor scales. In 2007, some of the cutpoints that were used to determine the students who are at risk and those with protection were changed. All changes were based on the analysis of the survey results from eight states across the nation, and were made to update the cutpoints and make them more representative of youth nation-wide. In order to be able to compare the results from the current data from the 2007 survey to the data from the two earlier PNA surveys (2003 and 2005), the data from those surveys were reanalyzed with the new cutpoints. Thus, some of the risk and protective factor values from the original 2003 and 2005 reports (which were reported on CSPR in previous years) will not exactly match the 2003 and 2005 values found in the 2007 reports. This has not been a problem for prevention planning since the new values accurately represent the trends in risk and protection over time. Further, the new analysis provides prevention planners with the ability to compare the percentage of students at risk and with protection to a more national sample for each of the risk and protective factor scales. We completed the 2009 survey and the results are shown. We noticed with the results of this risk factor that there were slight increases on perception. We will keep our eyes on these as we move forward to see what impact we can have as we move into the future.

| Performance Indicator | Instrument/ Data Source | Frequency of Collection | Year of most recent collection | Targets | Actual Performance | Baseline | Year Baseline Established |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|----------|---------------------------|
| | | | | 2006-07: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, | 2006-07: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.8%, Tobacco 0.7%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.1%, 8th | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%</p> | <p>Grade Alcohol 8.7%, Tobacco 3.4%, Marijuana 2.4%, Inhalants 3.3%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 7.6%, Marijuana 6.5%, Inhalants 2.2%, 12th Grade Alcohol 19.0%, Tobacco 9.7%, Marijuana 7.4%, Inhalant 1.7%</p> |
| <p>2007-08: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%</p> | <p>2007-08: 2007-2008 The data is the same as 2006-07. Another survey will be completed this spring.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| 2008-09: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, | 2008-09: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.3%, Tobacco 1.2%, Marijuana 0.4%, Inhalants 1.9%, 8th Grade Alcohol 6.6%, Tobacco 4.1%, Marijuana 3.2%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th |
|--|---|

| |
|---|
| Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0% |
|---|

2009-10: 6th
Grade
Alcohol
1.5%,
Tobacco
1.0%,
Marijuana
0.3%,
Inhalants
2.4%, 8th
Grade
Alcohol
7.6%,
Tobacco
3.0%,
Marijuana
2.5%,
Inhalants
3.0%, 10th
Grade
Alcohol
13.9%,
Tobacco
6.0%,
Marijuana
6.8%,
Inhalants
3.0%, 12th
Grade
Alcohol
18.1%,
Tobacco
10.0%,
Marijuana
8.0%,
Inhalants
1.0%

2010-11: 6th
Grade
Alcohol
1.5%,
Tobacco
1.0%,
Marijuana
0.3%,
Inhalants
2.4%, 8th

Grade Alcohol 12.9%, Tobacco 8.7%, Marijuana 7.4%, Inhalants 1.9%, 12th Grade Alcohol 17.1%, Tobacco 12.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.1%

6th Grade Alcohol 1.9%, Tobacco 1.4%, Marijuana 0.3%,

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|------|---|--|---|------|
| Decrease the percentage of students reporting "30 day use of ATODs" | Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison | Biennially | 2009 | Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0% | | Inhalants 3.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 8.6%, Tobacco 3.7%, Marijuana 2.9%, Inhalants 5.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 6.9%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.3%, 12th Grade Alcohol 21.1%, Tobacco 11.4%, Marijuana 10.0%, Inhalants 2.4%, | 2003 |
|---|---|------------|------|---|--|---|------|

Comments: We are pleased with the results of our prevention efforts in decreasing 30 day Alcohol use. Due to the extra effort put on Underage Drinking we see that the Alcohol 30 Day use has gone down in each area. We are seeing some slight increases in tobacco and marijuana use. However, at the levels we are currently prevention efforts are being successful in holding the use rate steady.

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | 2006-07: Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 382, Middle 1169, High 543; Fighting Expulsions, Elementary 1, Middle 1, High 4; Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 178, Middle 267, High 185; Weapons Expulsions, Elementary 1, Middle 4, High 17; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 1, Middle 156, High 249; Alcohol Expulsions, Elementary 0, Middle 0, High 0; Illicit Drug Suspensions, Elementary 46, Middle 696, High 977; Illicit Drug | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------|------|-------------|---|--|------|
| Decrease the number of suspensions and expulsions | Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and | Annually | 2009 | 2006-07: NA | Expulsions, Elementary 0, Middle 20, High 42; | Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 343, Middle | 2005 |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------|------|-------------|---|--|------|

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| for safe school violations and use/possession of ATODs. | Communities Effectiveness Report | | <p>2007-08: Fighting Suspensions, Elementary 427, Middle 1073, High 577; Fighting Explosions, Elementary 3, Middle 40, High 17; Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 223, Middle 276, High 188; Weapons Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 4, High 2; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 5, Middle 70, High 271; Alcohol Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 0, High 1; Illicit Drug Suspensions, Elementary 41, Middle 668, High 1099; Illicit Drug Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 5, High 21;</p> <p>2008-09: Refer to following pages of reports for the suspensions and explosions data.</p> | | <p>911, High 410; Fighting Explosions, Elementary 1, Middle 5, High 3; Weapons Suspensions, Elementary 156, Middle 230, High 156; Weapons Explosions, Elementary 1, Middle 19, High 23; Alcohol Suspensions, Elementary 14, Middle 108, High 252; Alcohol Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 1, High 0; Illicit Drug Suspensions, Elementary 63, Middle 580, High 895; Illicit Drug Explosions, Elementary 0, Middle 30, High 52;</p> | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|

Comments: Because the CSPR II Report requires the number of incidents for violent incidents with and without injury, weapons incidents, alcohol related incidents and drug incidents we see this page as a duplication and so this data will be provided on the following pages and deleted from this part of the report in the future.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

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

Weapons possession

Type of Weapon -Select either Real or Look-Alike. If both a real and look-alike weapon are possessed (i.e., real handgun and look alike handgun), select "Real". Real -A weapon capable of performing the action implied by its category (i.e., A "handgun" capable of firing a projectile with deadly force or a "Knife or Sharpened

Edge" capable of cutting.). Look-Alike -object, device or instrument having or made to have the appearance of a weapon. Examples include weapons that are broken or non-functional, toy guns and knives, devices made to look like bombs, and any object that is a non-functioning facsimile of a real weapon. Type of Violation -Select one of the following (ordered from most to least severe): Used, Threatened Use, or Possession. If two apply, select the more severe violation to report. Used -The weapon was employed (i.e., a handgun was fired, a stabbing or attempted stabbing took place, an explosive device was detonated, etc.). Threatened -The weapon (or look alike) was brandished or its presence made known and an intention to use was indicated. Possession --Having real or look alike weapons on their person, in their locker, under their control, or in their custody. Categories of Weapons -There are five categories of weapons in the system: Handgun; Rifle/Shotgun; BB/Pellet Gun; Knife/Sharpened Edge; and Other Weapon, Firearm or Explosive Device. Handgun --A firearm having a short stock designed to be held and fired by the use of a single hand and easily concealed upon the person. Examples include pistols, derringers, and revolvers. Rifle --A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder and to use the energy of the explosive in a fixed metallic cartridge to fire a projectile through a rifled bore. Shotgun --A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder and to use the energy of the explosive in a shotgun shell to fire either a number of ball shot or a single slug through a smooth bore. BB or Pellet Gun --Weapons where a small BB, pellet, or other projectile (usually 18 caliber or less) is fired through the use of a powerful spring or compressed gas mechanism. Knife / Sharpened Edge --Any object with a sharpened edge such as a knife, bayonet, razor blade, machete, sword, etc. Objects with sharpened points such as scissors, darts, spikes, nails, and pencils are "other" weapons. Other Weapon, Firearm or Explosive Device -All other weapons. All objects, devices, instruments, materials, or substances, whether animate or inanimate, used or intended to be used to inflict death or serious bodily injury that do not fit in the previous categories. Examples include: -Explosive or incendiary devices, rockets, missiles, etc. -Dangerous materials intended to be used or actually used to inflict harm on or intimidate any person. For examples, see the Dangerous Material definition. -Objects used as weapons -pencils, broken bottles or glass, chains, rocks, clubs, tire irons, darts, nails, rope, automobile, etc. -Unconventional weapons -spear gun, dart gun, sling shot, bow and arrow, cross bow, spear, martial arts weapons (nunchakus, throwing stars, etc.), electrical weapons or devices (stun guns, zip guns, etc.), blow guns, tear gas, pepper spray, etc.

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

| Grades | # Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury | # LEAs Reporting |
|------------------|--|------------------|
| K through 5 | 49 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | 128 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 80 | 91 |
| Comments: | | |

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

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

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

| Grades | # Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury | # LEAs Reporting |
|---|---|------------------|
| K through 5 | N<10 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | N<10 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | N<10 | 91 |
| Comments: This was the first year we had the data collected with and without physical injury, so we will be able to compare this with the years to come. | | |

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

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

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

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

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

| Grades | # Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury | # LEAs Reporting |
|---|---|------------------|
| K through 5 | 16 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | 33 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 48 | 91 |
| Comments: This was the first year we had the data collected with and without physical injury, so we will be able to compare this with the years to come. | | |

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

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

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

| Grades | # Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury | # LEAs Reporting |
|---|--|------------------|
| K through 5 | N<10 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | N<10 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | N<10 | 91 |
| Comments: This was the first year we had the data collected with and without physical injury, so we will be able to compare this with the years to come. | | |

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

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

| Grades | # Suspensions for Weapons Possession | # LEAs Reporting |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| K through 5 | 164 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | 233 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 211 | 91 |
| Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. | | |

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

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

| Grades | # Expulsion for Weapons Possession | # LEAs Reporting |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|
| K through 5 | N<10 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | N<10 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 10 | 91 |
| Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. | | |

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

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

| Grades | # Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents | # LEAs Reporting |
|--|---|------------------|
| K through 5 | N<10 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | 63 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 238 | 91 |
| Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. | | |

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

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

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

| Grades | # Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents | # LEAs Reporting |
|--|---|------------------|
| K through 5 | N<10 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | N<10 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | N<10 | 91 |
| Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. | | |

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

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

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

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

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

| Grades | # Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents | # LEAs Reporting |
|--|--|------------------|
| K through 5 | 26 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | 469 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 1,510 | 91 |
| Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. | | |

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

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

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

| Grades | # Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents | # LEAs Reporting |
|--|--|------------------|
| K through 5 | N<10 | 91 |
| 6 through 8 | N<10 | 91 |
| 9 through 12 | 40 | 91 |
| Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. | | |

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

Utah is in the fourth year of the Parents Empowered effort. This is a statewide media campaign which is focused on parent/child communication about alcohol and is aimed at reducing underage alcohol use. This is a joint effort between the USOE, the Division of Substance Abuse, Division of Highway Safety, Division of Alcohol Beverage Control, MADD, the Attorney General's Office, Utah Crime Council, Department of Health and the Local Substance Abuse Prevention Providers. Our media partners (R& R Partners) lead out in this successful campaign. If you will notice our data on use rates that was part of our performance measures you will see how alcohol use continues to decline. This is due to a comprehensive prevention effort throughout our state including the Parents Empowered Campaign because we see the very important role of parent involvement in the prevention effort.

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

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

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

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

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

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

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

| | # LEAs | % |
|--|--------|-----|
| Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total received Title V, Part A funds | 14 | |
| Comments: Because no new Title V, Part A funds were provided to LEAs, the SEA did not require a new needs assessment to be completed. | | |

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

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

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

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

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

| | \$ Amount | % |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities | 80,495 | 100.0 |
| Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs | 80,495 | |
| Comments: The old Title V, Part A funds were expended by LEAs in accordance with the approved 2007-2008 budgets and plans that aligned all expenditures with the four strategic priorities of Title V, Part A. | | |

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

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

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

| | # LEAs | # LEAs Met AYP |
|--|--------|----------------|
| Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities | 14 | 12 |
| Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities | 0 | |
| Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities | 0 | |
| Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds | 14 | 12 |
| Comments: Because no new Title V, Part A funds were allocated to LEAs for the 2008-2009 school year, the SEA does not believe that the limited carryover Title V, Part A funds expended had any significant impact on student performance and LEA AYP determinations. | | |

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

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

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

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

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

| | # LEAs |
|--|--------|
| # LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority | 0 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

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

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah does not participate in RLIS.

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

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

| | |
|--|----|
| Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2008-09? | No |
| Comments: | |

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

| | |
|--|----------|
| | # |
| LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b). | |
| Comments: No LEAs notified the state that they were transferring funds in 2008-09. | |

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

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

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

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