

**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 2009-10**

**UTAH**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 2013-2014, 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 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
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: <a href="mailto:brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov">brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov</a>		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Brenda Hales		
		Thursday, March 10, 2011, 11:43:29 AM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Utah State Board of Education adopted the English Language Arts and Mathematics Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in the summer of 2010. The Board outlined a five-year plan for statewide implementation of the CCSS beginning in fall of 2011. Full statewide implementation is expected by the fall of 2014-2015, at which time assessments aligned with the CCSS will be in place. Professional development to support implementation began in the spring of 2010 and will occur in accordance with the timeline rollout over the next five years. More information on implementation efforts can be found at <http://www.schools.utah.gov/core/>.

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

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)</b>
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	100.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Used for Purpose (yes/no)</b>
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	276,906		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,938		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,593		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	4,368		>97
Hispanic	41,162		>97
White, non-Hispanic	216,315		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	37,543		>97
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	19,513		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	109,724		>97
Migratory students	494		>97
Male	141,982		>97
Female	134,924		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,744	31.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,591	57.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,131	11.0
Total	37,466	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	297,106		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,182		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,160		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	4,514		>97
Hispanic	43,034		>97
White, non-Hispanic	233,635		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	38,926		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,558		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	114,938		>97
Migratory students	497		>97
Male	152,267		>97
Female	144,839		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,981	33.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	22,518	58.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,333	8.6
Total	38,832	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	272,269		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,810		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,686		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	4,087		>97
Hispanic	38,459		>97
White, non-Hispanic	214,882		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	32,905		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,698		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	100,991		>97
Migratory students	438		>97
Male	140,064		>97
Female	132,205		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,101	40.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,671	60.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	32,772	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,604	32,471	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	622	269	43.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,551	1,039	67.0
Black, non-Hispanic	764	356	46.6
Hispanic	6,878	3,386	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	35,466	27,200	76.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,821	3,403	49.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,836	1,300	33.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,972	11,313	59.6
Migratory students	86	44	51.2
Male	23,334	16,879	72.3
Female	22,270	15,592	70.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,623	35,379	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	623	337	54.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,550	1,169	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	761	460	60.4
Hispanic	6,882	4,088	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,485	29,059	81.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,847	3,569	52.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,833	1,613	42.1
Economically disadvantaged students	18,987	12,723	67.0
Migratory students	87	54	62.1
Male	23,348	17,339	74.3
Female	22,275	18,040	81.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	25	19	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic	N<10	N<10	
White, non-Hispanic	22	17	77.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21	18	85.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	N<10	N<10	
Economically disadvantaged students	10	N<10	
Migratory students			
Male	16	12	75.0
Female	N<10	N<10	
<b>Comments:</b> Out of level tests			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,290	33,849	74.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	592	281	47.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,577	1,121	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	715	366	51.2
Hispanic	6,738	3,657	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,407	28,238	79.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,793	3,413	50.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,570	1,349	37.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,626	11,834	63.5
Migratory students	96	49	51.0
Male	23,069	17,385	75.4
Female	22,221	16,464	74.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,314	34,609	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	592	306	51.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,572	1,171	74.5
Black, non-Hispanic	717	401	55.9
Hispanic	6,736	3,964	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,436	28,573	80.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,795	3,438	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,562	1,402	39.4
Economically disadvantaged students	18,633	12,232	65.6
Migratory students	96	57	59.4
Male	23,070	16,776	72.7
Female	22,244	17,833	80.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,275	28,985	64.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	591	179	30.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,577	851	54.0
Black, non-Hispanic	716	291	40.6
Hispanic	6,740	2,281	33.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,390	25,229	71.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,774	2,832	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,679	738	20.1
Economically disadvantaged students	18,617	9,061	48.7
Migratory students	96	33	34.4
Male	23,055	15,180	65.8
Female	22,220	13,805	62.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	44,355	34,073	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	598	315	52.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,548	1,170	75.6
Black, non-Hispanic	707	388	54.9
Hispanic	6,531	3,820	58.5
White, non-Hispanic	34,719	28,192	81.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,411	3,118	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,342	1,391	41.6
Economically disadvantaged students	18,113	12,020	66.4
Migratory students	66	33	50.0
Male	22,776	17,455	76.6
Female	21,579	16,618	77.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	44,379	34,451	77.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	598	314	52.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,544	1,113	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	707	431	61.0
Hispanic	6,546	3,784	57.8
White, non-Hispanic	34,732	28,617	82.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,408	2,989	46.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,344	1,137	34.0
Economically disadvantaged students	18,129	12,048	66.5
Migratory students	65	28	43.1
Male	22,782	17,115	75.1
Female	21,597	17,336	80.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	44,344	32,065	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	599	266	44.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,548	930	60.1
Black, non-Hispanic	705	352	49.9
Hispanic	6,530	2,935	44.9
White, non-Hispanic	34,710	27,405	79.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,400	3,032	47.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,496	836	23.9
Economically disadvantaged students	18,117	10,665	58.9
Migratory students	66	19	28.8
Male	22,773	16,848	74.0
Female	21,571	15,217	70.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	43,199	30,698	71.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	616	276	44.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,547	1,095	70.8
Black, non-Hispanic	627	306	48.8
Hispanic	6,375	3,059	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	33,823	25,810	76.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,888	2,126	36.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,157	889	28.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,195	9,963	57.9
Migratory students	77	32	41.6
Male	22,241	15,839	71.2
Female	20,958	14,859	70.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	43,182	34,108	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	615	357	58.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,537	1,184	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	628	390	62.1
Hispanic	6,363	3,859	60.6
White, non-Hispanic	33,830	28,157	83.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,890	2,551	43.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,142	1,127	35.9
Economically disadvantaged students	17,182	11,707	68.1
Migratory students	76	36	47.4
Male	22,236	16,774	75.4
Female	20,946	17,334	82.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	43,133	31,732	73.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	615	290	47.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,535	1,039	67.7
Black, non-Hispanic	630	323	51.3
Hispanic	6,356	3,116	49.0
White, non-Hispanic	33,787	26,823	79.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,879	2,504	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,100	870	28.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,160	10,388	60.5
Migratory students	78	26	33.3
Male	22,214	16,696	75.2
Female	20,919	15,036	71.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	40,784	31,198	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	592	321	54.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,407	1,032	73.3
Black, non-Hispanic	602	312	51.8
Hispanic	5,764	3,186	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	32,223	26,205	81.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,675	2,090	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,329	846	36.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15,607	10,101	64.7
Migratory students	61	34	55.7
Male	20,651	15,831	76.7
Female	20,133	15,367	76.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,473	34,764	83.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	602	368	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,409	1,165	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	617	424	68.7
Hispanic	5,936	3,977	67.0
White, non-Hispanic	32,712	28,667	87.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,841	2,118	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,376	921	38.8
Economically disadvantaged students	16,022	11,800	73.6
Migratory students	63	38	60.3
Male	21,073	16,831	79.9
Female	20,400	17,933	87.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,138	29,912	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	588	240	40.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,403	893	63.6
Black, non-Hispanic	609	315	51.7
Hispanic	5,865	2,585	44.1
White, non-Hispanic	32,478	25,743	79.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,647	1,764	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,303	413	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	15,828	9,163	57.9
Migratory students	59	21	35.6
Male	20,867	15,211	72.9
Female	20,271	14,701	72.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	34,591	22,714	65.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	460	182	39.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,203	739	61.4
Black, non-Hispanic	477	190	39.8
Hispanic	4,575	1,768	38.6
White, non-Hispanic	27,712	19,731	71.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,259	1,139	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,711	320	18.7
Economically disadvantaged students	11,974	6,080	50.8
Migratory students	59	20	33.9
Male	17,727	11,615	65.5
Female	16,864	11,099	65.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	40,230	34,658	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	566	404	71.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,387	1,138	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	582	418	71.8
Hispanic	5,767	4,078	70.7
White, non-Hispanic	31,741	28,456	89.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,458	2,274	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,178	896	41.1
Economically disadvantaged students	14,712	11,348	77.1
Migratory students	72	40	55.6
Male	20,853	17,254	82.7
Female	19,377	17,404	89.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	39,983	28,642	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	558	235	42.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,387	884	63.7
Black, non-Hispanic	578	279	48.3
Hispanic	5,717	2,408	42.1
White, non-Hispanic	31,558	24,710	78.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,285	1,620	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,980	405	20.5
Economically disadvantaged students	14,551	8,135	55.9
Migratory students	70	22	31.4
Male	20,690	15,019	72.6
Female	19,293	13,623	70.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	23,463	8,381	35.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	465	111	23.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	774	233	30.1
Black, non-Hispanic	485	103	21.2
Hispanic	4,369	951	21.8
White, non-Hispanic	17,246	6,947	40.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,619	1,327	36.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,593	216	13.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9,422	2,821	29.9
Migratory students	60	N<10	
Male	12,388	4,557	36.8
Female	11,075	3,824	34.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	37,501	32,151	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	594	371	62.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,295	1,051	81.2
Black, non-Hispanic	561	378	67.4
Hispanic	4,968	3,271	65.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,924	26,948	90.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,593	1,775	49.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,451	381	26.3
Economically disadvantaged students	11,681	8,658	74.1
Migratory students	52	25	48.1
Male	19,217	15,990	83.2
Female	18,284	16,161	88.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,552	36,826	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	867	315	36.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,240	1,066	47.6
Black, non-Hispanic	855	328	38.4
Hispanic	7,269	2,506	34.5
White, non-Hispanic	47,079	32,470	69.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,766	1,994	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,049	360	17.6
Economically disadvantaged students	16,795	8,102	48.2
Migratory students	77	19	24.7
Male	30,544	20,239	66.3
Female	28,008	16,587	59.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	986	661	67.0
Districts	112	87	77.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	276	184	66.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	199	123	61.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	77	61	79.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
86	63	73.3
<b>Comments:</b> This data is correct.		

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>1</sup>)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> No schools in Utah were in Corrective Action.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments:</b> No schools in Utah were in Restructuring.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	3
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	3
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	3	2
Schools	88	86
<b>Comments:</b> The number of appeals increased significantly in 2010 for two reasons:		
1. The largest Utah LEA discovered an error in attendance calculation after data had been submitted. This error impacted the AYP result for a large number of their schools. The LEA appealed the results based on corrected attendance data. This issue accounted for most of the increase in appeals.		
2. There were technical issues with Utah's Online Test Delivery System which impacted testing at some schools. Some impacted schools appealed the AYP result.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/25/10
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	4,025	2,953
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	2,297	1,600
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	57.1	54.2
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	4,095	3,001
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	2,809	1,927
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	68.6	64.2
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	11
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	8

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

**Comments:**

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		12	8	2	A	
2		12	8	2	A	
3		12	8	2	A	
4		12	8	2	A	

**Comments:** One additional school in improvement status in 2009-10 made AYP, but exited improvement status as an identified and served American Recovery and Reinvestment Act School Improvement Grant. All schools in the first year of ARRA SIG implementation receive a fresh start. Only one of the twelve schools in improvement did not make AYP though they had done so the year prior. That particular school moved to Year 2 improvement status.

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

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement



**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0%

**Comments:**

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

In partnership with the Southwest Comprehensive Center, the American Institute of Research assisted the USOE in designing an evaluation of the state systems of support. The evaluation was designed and implemented during the 2008-09 school year. The information gained assisted USOE in revising and refining the current systems of support for use in 2009-10.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

All of the above funding streams allowed schools, including schools in improvement, receiving those funds to focus on student achievement in a very targeted manner and enhance the learning opportunities for students. These funds supported teachers with professional development, trained parents in tutoring so they could assist their students, and offered additional learning time for students through before and after school programs, summer schools, and optional extended day kindergarten classes. Administrators also received additional professional development through the Principal's Literacy Academy or the Title I Principals' Institute in order to be a more effective instructional leader. As a result of many of these leader and as a result of many of these efforts, 11 of the 12 schools identified for improvement in 2009-10 achieved AYP. Eight of those schools exited improvement status.

**1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

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

**1.4.9.1 Public School Choice**

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

**1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students**

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	9,089
Applied to transfer	44
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	44
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 7,214

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

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

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	414
Applied for supplemental educational services	92
Received supplemental educational services	89
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 70,744
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	99,481	82,324	82.8	17,157	17.2
All elementary classes	13,383	12,472	93.2	911	6.8
All secondary classes	86,098	69,852	81.1	16,246	18.9

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
---	---

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full day self-contained classroom equals one class.
---

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	39.2
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	14.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	46.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	21.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	38.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	2,780	2,662	95.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,288	3,129	95.2
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	17,374	14,023	80.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	18,077	16,025	88.6
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	57.3	25.7
Poverty metric used	economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	
Secondary schools	46.8	23.9
Poverty metric used	economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

**1.6 TITLE III LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	46,908
<b>Comments:</b> This number differs by two (2) students from the data in 1.6.3.1.1.	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	46,194
<b>Comments:</b> This number differs by two (2) students from the data in 1.6.3.2.1.	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	38,404
Navajo; Navaho	1,198
Vietnamese	808
Tonga (Tonga Islands)	655
Somali	591

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	40,119
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,787
Total	46,906
<p><b>Comments:</b> Utah's ELL count reflected in section 1.6.2.1 is based on a year long unduplicated ELL student enrollment. The count of students reflected in section 1.6.3.1.1 (number participating in USOE's LEP assessment - UALPA) is the number of ELL students enrolled during the spring 2010 assessment period.</p> <p>Utah's ELL student population's documented high mobility is a known contributing factor to the difference between the unduplicated year-long count of ELL students and the count of students identified eligible to be tested in late spring. The discrepancy is within our predicted margins. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's identified ELL population.</p>	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	14,884
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	37.1
<b>Comments:</b> .	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	39,575
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,617
Total	46,192
<p><b>Comments:</b> Utah's ELL count reflected in section 1.6.2.1 is based on a year long unduplicated ELL student enrollment. The count of students reflected in section 1.6.3.2.1 (number participating in USOE's LEP assessment - UALPA) is the number of ELL students enrolled during the spring 2010 assessment period.                  Utah's ELL student population's documented high mobility is a known contributing factor to the difference between the unduplicated year-long count of ELL students and the count of students identified eligible to be tested in late spring. The discrepancy is within our predicted margins. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's identified ELL population.</p>	
<p>In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).</p>	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	9,644

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	<b>Results</b>		<b>Targets</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	8,192	27.4		35.00
Attained proficiency	14,638	37.0		25.00
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
English
<b>Comments:</b> Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
English
<b>Comments:</b> Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
English
<b>Comments:</b> Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
4,458	7,839	12,297
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,816	5,934	67.3	2,882
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9,834	8,285	84.2	1,549
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,619	4,136	54.3	3,483
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	39
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	18
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	36
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	38
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	21
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

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

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>      </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

##### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
6,589	612	5

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on input from U.S. Department of Education, the State of Utah used new criteria to provide Title III Immigrant funding to fewer LEAs that had a significant increase in the percentage of immigrant students.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	298
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	102

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	39	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	39	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	39	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	39	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	39	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	14	387
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	16	18
PD provided to principals	4	6
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	10	87
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	78
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>580</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

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

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	09/01/09	60
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2010-2011 school year, LEAs could start the application process in advance of the July 1 funds availability.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	

**Comments:** There are no persistently dangerous schools in Utah.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	77.4
Hispanic	70.7
White, non-Hispanic	91.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	81.0
Limited English proficient	68.9
Economically disadvantaged	78.0
Migratory students	62.7
Male	86.8
Female	89.6

**Comments:** Regarding the graduation rate for migratory students, the increase from last program year to the current program year may be attributed simply to mathematical factors. The number of secondary-age students (i.e., 9th - 12th grade) decreased from the 2008/2009 program year from 384 to 207 for the 2009/2010 program year. Another factor may be the increase in the number of secondary-age migrant students that are "settling out" of the 36 month eligibility: in other words, students are spending more time in Utah schools. Another reason may point to the increased efforts in the Utah Migrant Education Program to track credits for graduation and classify high school migrant students that are lacking credits for graduation as "Priority-for-Service". In sum, more efforts and services are being focused towards assisting high school migrant students to graduate.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Regarding the graduation rate for migratory students, the increase from last program year to the current program year may be attributed simply to mathematical factors. The number of secondary-age students (i.e., 9th - 12th grade) decreased from the 2008/2009 program year from 384 to 207 for the 2009/2010 program year. Another factor may be the increase in the number of secondary-age migrant students that are "settling out" of the 36 month eligibility: in other words, students are spending more time in Utah schools. Another reason may point to the increased efforts in the Utah Migrant Education Program to track credits for graduation and classify high school migrant students that are lacking credits for graduation as "Priority-for-Service". In sum, more efforts and services are being focused towards assisting high school migrant students to graduate.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	6.5
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4.5
Limited English proficient	6.7
Economically disadvantaged	4.7
Migratory students	4.7
Male	3.2
Female	<3
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

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

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	31	31
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	41	41
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	N<10
K	422	742
1	448	1,035
2	454	1,098
3	472	1,022
4	417	1,082
5	409	983
6	351	886
7	284	817
8	225	836
9	193	752
10	167	740
11	134	724
12	188	821
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total		
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	204	857
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,629	9,864
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	135	250
Hotels/Motels	196	567
Total	4,164	11,538
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	33
K	654
1	843
2	899
3	843
4	868
5	779
6	715
7	728
8	691
9	669
10	558
11	550
12	551
Ungraded	
Total	9,381
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	410
Migratory children/youth	94
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,679
Limited English proficient students	2,232
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	10
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	10
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	10
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	10
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	7
Transportation	10
School records	0
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	659	362
4	737	418
5	643	368
6	586	335
7	599	385
8	532	360
High School	394	249
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	660	339
4	733	407
5	643	388
6	589	296
7	595	319
8	437	165
High School	367	89
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	160
K	114
1	106
2	106
3	106
4	84
5	76
6	82
7	62
8	73
9	55
10	59
11	50
12	36
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,179

**Comments:** .

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although Utah has not yet completed quantitative research to conclude why fewer migrant students are being identified, many conversations and Comprehensive Needs Assessment (C.N.A.) surveys have been done with migrant families and MEP, LEA ID&R recruiters and personnel. That qualitative data have lent substantial insight into reasons for declining migrant student populations.

During the summer of 2007, a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (I.C.E.) incursion was conducted in one of the larger migrant employers in Utah. There have been continued negative outcomes of that activity in the migrant population. Their willingness to be forthcoming with sensitive personal information (i.e., National COE data) to Utah MEP personnel has been jeopardized and subsequently fewer migrant families were determined eligible for services.

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

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41
K	36
1	41
2	46
3	45
4	35
5	26
6	26
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	327
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Results of Comprehensive Needs Assessments have determined that in certain areas of Utah, qualifying migrant activities do not lend Summer Intersession Programs. These local Migrant Education Programs are turning their services to activities that occur during the regular education school year. For this reason, fewer migrant students are being identified as participating in Summer Migrant Education Programs.

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: The system that Utah used for the 2009/2010 school year reporting period is the Migrant Achievement and Performance System (MAPS), [www.ertcmaps.com](http://www.ertcmaps.com).

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

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

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each child in the count is taken directly from the approved National COEs. Furthermore, the MAPS system automatically calculates (using the QAD) the exact number of students that were eligible within the last three years. Also using the QAD, the MAPS system calculates all students who were residents for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 to August 31st). The qualifying activity for each child's family is included on the approved National COE (which is maintained in the Utah MAPS system electronically). LEAs/LOAs are required to enter on the electronic National COE each child age. LEAs/LOAs are also required to input into the MAPS system (for each child) any and all MEP services provided during summer, academic year, or intersession. Districts are also required to input each students current grade level in relation to each child count category. The MAPS system maintains all of this data and creates an end of year report including each of these topics.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2009/2010 program year, the Utah MEP conducted a Prospective Re-interview following the protocol as instructed in the Federal Regulations SEC. 200.89(b)(2). A random sample of students was identified from each Utah migrant program districts using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The sampling was designed to ensure that twenty-six families were identified from a random selection from the Utah migrant districts to ensure that a minimum of six different families were re-interviewed from each of the 14 Utah local migrant programs. After discussion with the state director and the districts it was estimated that in order to identify any problems or issues with identification and recruitment in a district a minimum of six families needed to be re-interviewed in each program. Twenty-six families were randomly selected from each district as an oversample based on the assumption that the auditor would have a 50% contact rate in order to successfully contact six families per district. This percentage is based on previous years contact rate in Utah with re-interview process by ERTC. It was also understood that in some of the smallest local programs the auditor may not be able to successfully find six families. In which case the interviewer was given all the COEs from those districts and required to contact each family a minimum of three times. As a result in some circumstances there were less than six families interviewed in the smallest districts. There were also a few districts which had yet to receive approval for any COEs in 2009-2010, these districts had zero contacts. The interviewer from Educational Research and Training Corporation (ERTC) was then asked to construct an interviewing schedule using the sample. The interviewer (Ms. Hilda Lloyd) was provided copies of the COEs from the sample and contact names in each district by the state migrant director to assist them in locating families of students within the sample. The interviewing schedule was discussed with the project coordinator as well as the state migrant director. The re-interviewing process began in April 2010 and was completed by May, 2010. In its most direct form, the analysis for this project is fairly straight forward. The interviewer indicated on the interview protocol any questions regarding the accuracy of the recruiter and any questions regarding student eligibility. The interviewer used the OME guidance from 2003 to ascertain student eligibility depending on the date of initial qualification. The project coordinator then reviewed all the results of the written interview protocols in relation to the original Certificates of Eligibility from 2009-2010. The project coordinator then supported or contested the audit interviewer's assessment. Finally, the Utah State Migrant Director reviewed the forms and the findings so that an agreement by three distinct reviewers facilitated the validity of the process. In addition, each of the reviewers was asked to identify any other issues (e.g. intentional fraud, high defect rates from certain recruiters, etc.) that were of importance to note and help to further clarify recruitment identification and eligibility issues for the state of Utah. A record of each interview protocol, the independent judgments and comments of each reviewer (i.e., audit interviewers, project coordinator, and state director) is available and will be maintained for review at the Utah Department of Education. There were no discrepancies found during the review process (i.e. the audit interviewer, the project coordinator, and the state migrant director all agreed on recruitment issues. The Utah audit assessment of recruiter effectiveness was completed over the agreed upon contract period by Educational Research and Training Corporation. It was clear that there were fewer issues in 2009-2010 in recruiting than in previous years that need to be addressed as part of a training program for local district recruiters. A few of the most common recruiter errors were: qualifying person on COE

conflict--different name on COE; students being re-enrolled in the program that had not made qualifying moves, families doing nonqualifying work, out of date qualifying arrival dates, and families that were settled out and had lived in respective communities as permanent residents. Most of the mistakes made by recruiters on the COEs did not result in the ineligibility of the students in those families.

Of the thirty-eight students interviewed in the sample only four were ineligible for services (10.5%).

#### Recommendations

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

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

In

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Utah MAPS system allows for constant quality management. The SEA, MEP staff checks each LEA's COE and migrant student data submission each Friday of the week during the entire duration of the program year. Any inaccuracies or problems are immediately corrected by correspondence with LEA, MEP staff. At the end of May of each year and again at the end of October of each year, MAPS and student data from the State Data Warehouse are uploaded and merged by way of matching SSID numbers and intense scrutiny of mismatches or inconsistencies of information from those data merges.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All LEA/LOA approved National COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and approves through MAPS each COE. Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review, they are sent back to the district for re-interview. All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian, LEA/LOA ID&R recruiter, LEA/LOA Director, and SEA are entered into the MAPS system no later than the end of May and October of each year. At the time of data merge from the MAPS system and the State Data Warehouse, any inconsistent and/or suspect data, or duplication identified and corrected by the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family. A new National Certificate of Eligibility (paper copies) is completed each year on every eligible migrant student by family and submitted through the MAPS system to the SEA (Max Lang) for review and approval. MAPS data is over viewed and a copy file is saved for all student data in the system for each program year at the end of October. No students entered into MAPS after August 31st of each program year are counted in the Regular Term or Summer Unduplicated count for the previous program year's report.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Results from the 2009/2010 Prospective Re-interview conducting during the were shared with each participating LEA/LOA in a unique report and in conjunction with a Utah State MEP LEA/LOA Directors' meeting. Where ineligibility determinations were encountered, LEA/LOAs are required to demonstrate how those students were taken off Migrant Education Program rolls. Also, LEA/LOAs are required to define corrective actions to eliminated future occurrences of similar problems and recruiting mistakes in their individual LEA/LOAs . The SEA will continue to conduct Identification and Recruitment training sessions to define specific areas to be improved and methods and procedures to improve them.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has no concerns at this time.