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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
___Part I, 2009-10 _X_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: brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov

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

_____ Tuesday, April 26, 2011, 2:55:20 PM
Signature

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	11,818	7,568	64.0
4	11,364	7,734	68.1
5	11,066	7,896	71.4
6	7,911	4,832	61.1
7	2,026	1,016	50.1
8	1,695	597	35.2
High School	317	67	21.1
Total	46,197	29,710	64.3
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	11,824	8,215	69.5
4	11,368	7,856	69.1
5	11,077	7,787	70.3
6	7,889	5,484	69.5
7	2,129	1,406	66.0
8	2,115	1,504	71.1
High School	356	235	66.0
Total	46,758	32,487	69.5
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,449	3,315	74.5
4	4,208	3,345	79.5
5	3,875	3,040	78.5
6	2,842	1,980	69.7
7	1,900	1,401	73.7
8	1,489	860	57.8
High School	544	240	44.1
Total	19,307	14,181	73.5
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,450	3,619	81.3
4	4,215	3,370	80.0
5	3,878	3,169	81.7
6	2,837	2,275	80.2
7	1,922	1,614	84.0
8	1,740	1,505	86.5
High School	911	785	86.2
Total	19,953	16,337	81.9
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	19,582
Limited English proficient students	24,589
Students who are homeless	6,643
Migratory students	1,013
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,591
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,591
Black, non-Hispanic	3,171
Hispanic	37,638
White, non-Hispanic	91,206
Total	142,197
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	270	2,703			2,973
K	5,098	14,763			19,861
1	5,053	14,269			19,322
2	4,910	13,687			18,597
3	4,858	13,150			18,008
4	4,771	12,508			17,279
5	4,375	12,169			16,544
6	3,241	8,794			12,035
7	2,380	2,532			4,912
8	2,126	2,498			4,624
9	2,026	1,621			3,647
10	1,302	491			1,793
11	1,188	582			1,770
12	1,031	613			1,644
Ungraded					
TOTALS	42,629	100,380			143,009
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	224
Reading/language arts	255
Science	N<10
Social studies	N<10
Vocational/career	N<10
Other instructional services	N<10
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	82	
Paraprofessionals[1]	58	98.3
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	2	
Clerical support staff	4	
Administrators (non-clerical)	8	
Comments:		

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	630.10	99.7
Comments:		

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

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	2
Comments:	

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2009. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	55
2. Adults participating	60
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	35
4. Participating children	94
a. Birth through 2 years	51
b. Ages 3 through 5	29
c. Ages 6 through 8	14
c. Above age 8	N<10
Comments:	

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	33
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	34
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	28
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	26
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	15
Comments:	

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2010). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	12
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	N<10
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	18
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	20
5. Total families enrolled	55
Comments:	

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

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

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	15	N<10	
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	11	N<10	Advance to next level
BEST			
BEST Plus	12	N<10	Advance to next level
BEST Literacy	16	11	Advance to next level
Other			
Comments:			

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED			
Other			
Comments:			
Non-School-Age Adults	**# With Goal**	**# Who Met Goal**	**Explanation (if applicable)**
Diploma	N<10	N<10	
GED	N<10	N<10	Passed sections but still working on the whole test
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post- Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					
PPVT-IV	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					
PPVT-IV	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2010 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	N<10	N<10	N<10	21.0	
Comments:					

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	N<10	N<10	DIBELS
1	N<10	N<10	DIBELS
2	N<10	N<10	DIBELS
3	N<10	N<10	DIBELS
Comments:			

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

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

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

	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	31	19	.3 gain or more
PEP Scale II	28	22	.3 gain or more
PEP Scale III	31	20	.3 gain or more
PEP Scale IV			N/A
Other			
Comments:			

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	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	

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

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	79
K	19
1	11
2	15
3	14
4	20
5	N<10
6	13
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments:	

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	48
K	82
1	82
2	89
3	65
4	48
5	53
6	52
7	28
8	43
9	28
10	32
11	24
12	18
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	
Comments: Fewer Utah students are being identified as eligible for Migrant Education Services. Therefore, fewer students are being identified as Limited English Proficient.	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13
K	12
1	N<10
2	16
3	19
4	14
5	10
6	20
7	11
8	15
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: There have been fewer eligible migrant identified as eligible for Migrant Education services in Utah overall. Therefore, fewer migrant students have been identified for services under IDEA.	

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2009. The totals are calculated automatically.

	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
Age/Grade	**12 Months**	**Previous 13 – 24 Months**	**Previous 25 – 36 Months**	**Previous 37 – 48 Months**
Age birth through 2	N<10	N<10		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46	49	44	21
K	28	33	30	22
1	27	28	26	27
2	21	30	28	25
3	33	26	27	19
4	11	32	24	17
5	21	13	25	17
6	13	25	24	20
7	17	18	16	12
8	18	20	16	18
9	N<10	11	20	16
10	15	13	21	N<10
11	N<10	12	17	14
12	N<10	N<10	16	N<10
Ungraded				
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
Total				

Comments: The current lack of National Immigration policy paired with MEP eligibility definitions, identifying and recruiting students to the Utah MEP has become more difficult. Recruiters report that families are resistant to questions and many times avoid the outreach workers altogether. Therefore, those students who have recently arrived in local programs are much more likely to not be identified as eligible for the Utah MEP; their families are simply more likely to avoid MEP recruiters and/or refuse to be interviewed.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2009. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	108
K	65
1	60
2	60
3	63
4	51
5	48
6	43
7	36
8	37
9	32
10	27
11	24
12	19
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Total	
Comments: There are fewer eligible migrant students this MEP program year and last year. Either there are fewer eligible migrant students in this category or many students in this age range have "settled-out" of the Utah MEP.	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2008-09 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	0
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	86	86
4	84	84
5	65	65
6	76	76
7	62	62
8	72	72
HS	52	52
Ungraded		
Total	497	497

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

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	86	86
4	84	84
5	66	66
6	77	77
7	62	61
8	59	59
HS	60	59
Ungraded		
Total	494	492

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

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	35
K	112
1	102
2	94
3	90
4	75
5	65
6	82
7	62
8	71
9	55
10	57
11	50
12	36
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	10
Total	
Comments: In referencing MEP evaluation reports, more LEAs are offering services during the Regular School Year, specifically to secondary migrant students, to supplement other existing education programs.	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	31
K	19
1	11
2	12
3	11
4	19
5	N<10
6	13
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

Comments: in referencing MEP evaluations, many LEAs have determined it more effective to provide services to migrant students during the Regular School Year to supplement other existing education programs.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

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

Comments: More Utah migrant students are "settling out" of their 36 months of eligibility for the MEP, so more LEAs are providing a continuation of services for these students.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	88
1	81
2	71
3	61
4	60
5	57
6	66
7	61
8	68
9	53
10	53
11	50
12	37
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	10
Total	
Comments: In responding to results from ongoing MEP evaluations, many LEAs have decided to provide more services to migrant students during the regular year to supplement existing educational programs.	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	N<10	
K	88	87	
1	81	78	
2	71	68	
3	61	57	
4	60	58	
5	57	57	
6	66	64	
7	61	60	
8	68	68	
9	53	52	N<10
10	53	52	11
11	50	50	N<10
12	37	37	N<10
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	10	10	N<10
Total			

Comments: In responding to results from ongoing MEP evaluations, many LEAs have decided to provide more services to migrant students during the regular year to supplement existing educational programs.

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25	
K	18	
1	15	
2	16	N<10
3	12	
4	10	
5	10	
6	N<10	
7	N<10	
8	N<10	
9	16	N<10
10	N<10	N<10
11	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	N<10
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	N<10	
Total		
Comments: In response to results from ongoing MEP evaluations, many LEAs have been providing services during the regular school year when more students have show to be in school: hence, the increase in the number of students receiving services.		

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23
K	15
1	11
2	12
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	

Comments: In response to results from ongoing MEP evaluations, many LEAs have been providing services during the regular school year when more students have show to be in school: hence, the increase in the number of students receiving services.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41
K	36
1	42
2	45
3	45
4	35
5	26
6	26
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services -During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	40
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	11
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	
9	N<10
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	11
3	15
4	N<10
5	11
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: Many migrant students in the Utah MEP have reached the end of their 36 months of eligibility for the program. Man LEAs have decided that providing for continuation of services for these students is a valuable use of resources.	

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	39
K	35
1	41
2	45
3	45
4	34
5	26
6	25
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

Comments: Many Utah migrant students have reached the conclusion of their 36 months of eligibility for the program. A number of LEAs have determined that providing a continuation of services was a valuable use of resources. Since a number of these students were still technically eligible for MEP services during the reporting year, many LEAs counted them as "eligible migrant students" that received MEP services.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	39	39	
K	35	35	
1	41	41	
2	45	45	
3	45	45	
4	34	34	
5	26	26	
6	25	25	
7	N<10	N<10	
8	N<10	N<10	
9	N<10	N<10	N<10
10	N<10	N<10	N<10
11	N<10	N<10	N<10
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total			

Comments: The results from ongoing LEA /MEP evaluations created changes in programmatic emphasis that did not focus as much on credit accrual for secondary aged migrant students.

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	
K		
1	N<10	
2	12	
3	14	
4	N<10	
5	11	
6	N<10	
7	N<10	
8		
9		
10		
11	N<10	
12		
Ungraded		
Out-of-school		
Total		

Comments: The results from ongoing LEA /MEP evaluations created changes in programmatic emphasis, determining that some type of support service was what was needed to eliminate specific barriers to the academic success of Utah migrant students.

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	N<10
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: The results from ongoing LEA /MEP evaluations created changes in programmatic emphasis, determining that types of referred service was not what was needed to eliminate specific barriers to the academic success of Utah migrant students. Therefore, fewer students were reported in this category.	

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	160
K	113
1	106
2	104
3	105
4	84
5	76
6	82
7	62
8	72
9	55
10	57
11	50
12	36
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	10
Total	
Comments: Overall, there were fewer migrant students counted in the Utah MEP for the 2009/2010 program year. Therefore, fewer students were reported as participating in the Utah MEP.	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	177
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	1,209
Comments: Overall, there were fewer students identified as eligible for MEP services during the 2009/2010 program year. Therefore, fewer students were reported in this category.	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

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

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	57	447
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	
Summer/intersession only	19	327
Year round	54	473
Comments: Results from ongoing LEA/MEP evaluations create situations where programs must take into account the change barriers and subsequent needs of their migrant students. This creates changes in how and on what LEAs spend money in order to supplement exisiting educational programs to better eliminate barriers to academic achievement and ensure success.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.

b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.

c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).

d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.

e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.60
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	5	3.30	118	113.00
Counselors	0	0.00	4	4.00
All paraprofessionals	58	23.10	74	66.00
Recruiters	17	9.65	11	9.60
Records transfer staff	2	0.60	3	2.25
Comments: During the 2009/2010 program year, the Utah MEP welcomed a new LEA, Washington County. Washington County School District has used its MEP resources to hire more teacher and paraprofessional time.				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
   1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
   2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.

c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.

d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.

e. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.

f. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	**FTE**	**Headcount**	**FTE**
Qualified Paraprofessionals	43	12.30	63	51.60
Comments:				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
   1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
   2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	2	50
Juvenile detention	10	8
Juvenile corrections	7	70
Adult corrections	2	365
Other	1	44
Total	22	179

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	5
Comments: Please see the next comment section for explanation on reduction of numbers from last year to this year. Thank you.	

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	2
Juvenile Detention	10
Juvenile Corrections	7
Adult Corrections	2
Other	1
Total	22
Comments: From last year to this, you see significant changes (reductions) in our totals. These are due to other state agencies' choices -- reducing the # students we served. For next year's CSPR report, you should see our numbers rising again since the other agencies have retracted the earlier decisions that negatively impacted the number of students we serve. Thank you.	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	44	888	213	129	111
Long Term Students Served	N<10	37	119	129	111

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10	46	N<10	N<10	N<10
Asian or Pacific Islander	N<10	16	N<10	N<10	N<10
Black, non-Hispanic	N<10	35	N<10	18	N<10
Hispanic	14	173	62	51	18
White, non-Hispanic	21	618	129	46	82
Total					

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	31	683	185	129	61
Female	13	205	28	N<10	50
Total	44	888	213		111

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
6	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
7	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
8	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
9	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
11	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
12	N<10	22	N<10	N<10	N<10
13	N<10	53	N<10	N<10	N<10
14	N<10	79	12	N<10	N<10
15	N<10	180	24	N<10	10
16	12	239	47	N<10	21
17	13	258	77	10	60
18	17	46	41	20	17
19	N<10	N<10	N<10	35	N<10
20	N<10	N<10	N<10	50	N<10
21	N<10	N<10	N<10	13	N<10
Total					

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Zeros are zeros and not blanks.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	1	12	1	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	1	3	2	0
Awarded GED(s)	1	2	1	0
Comments: zeros are intended where zeros are found.				

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	44	624	92	
Enrolled in a GED program	N<10	N<10	N<10	
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	40	799	N<10	
Earned a GED	N<10	N<10	N<10	
Obtained high school diploma	N<10	13	25	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	N<10	N<10	N<10	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	N<10	N<10	N<10	
Comments: zeros are intended where zeros are found.				

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs				
Comments: Utah's focus is on core academic curricula and gains.				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	N<10	N<10	N<10	
Obtained employment	N<10	14	N<10	
Comments: Utah's focus is on core academic curricula and gains. zeros are intended where zeros are found.				

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		82	103	29
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		80	26	25

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		10	N<10	N<10
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		19	N<10	N<10
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		16	N<10	N<10
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		19	N<10	17
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		16	16	N<10
Comments: zeros are intended. no blank data.				

FAQ on long-term students:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		72	122	31
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		80	31	25

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		N<10	N<10	N<10
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		14	N<10	N<10
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		29	N<10	N<10
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		14	N<10	15
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		14	15	N<10
Comments: zeros are intended. no blank data.				

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.
Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

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

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

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease or hold steady the number of "persistently dangerous schools" as defined by Board Rule R277-483. "Persistently Dangerous Schools."	Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Effectiveness Report	Annually	2009-2010	2007-08: 2007-08: 2007-08: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2008-09: 2008-09: 2008-09: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2009-10: 2009-10: 2009-10: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2010-11: 2010-11: 2010-11: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2011-12: 2010-11: 2010-11: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2007-08: 2007-08: 2007-08: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2008-09: 2008-09: 2008-09: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2009-10: 2009-10: 2009-10: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2003

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

conducive to learning is a top priority.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Favorable Attitudes to Antisocial Behaviors"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2009	2007-08: 200-08: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2007-08: 2007-08 Grade 28.9%, 8th Grade 27.6%, 10th Grade 37.1%, 12th	6th Grade 30.5% 8th Grade 25.4% 10th Grade 35.3% 12th Grade 36.1%	2003
				2008-09: 200-09: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2008-09: 2008-09: Grade 6th 28.8%, 8th Grade 26.6%, 10th Grade 36.5%, 12th 39.6%		
				2009-10: 200-10: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2009-10: 2009-10 The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2010-11: 201-11: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%			
				2011-12: 201-12: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%			

Comments: Previous reporting years explain the SHARP Survey and changes. Please note that the data from 2009-10 is the same as was reported in 2008-09. We are preparing for the 2011 SHARP Survey and those results will be reported on next year's report.

		Frequency	Year of most				Year

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	of Collection	recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Intentions to use ATODs"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2009	2007-08: 2008: 6th Grade 20.0%, 8th Grade 11.8%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2007-08: 2007-08: 6th Grade 20.3%, 8th Grade 13.4%, 10th Grade 18.7%, 12th Grade 19.2%	6th Grade 23.0% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 16.4% 12th Grade 12.0%	2003
				2008-09: 2009: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2008-09: 2008-09: 6th Grade 21.8% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 19.0% 12th Grade 21.8 %		
				2009-10: 2010: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2009-10: 2009-10 The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2010-11: 2011: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%			
				2011-12: 2012: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%			

Comments: Previous reporting years explain the SHARP Survey and changes. Please note that the data from 2009-10 is the same as was reported in 2008-09. We are preparing for the 2011 SHARP Survey and those results will be reported on next year's report.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 2008: 6th			

				Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 21.6%	2007-08: 2007-08: 6th Grade 31.1%, 8th Grade 22.6%, 10th Grade 29.1%, 12th Grade 22.6%		
				2008-09: 2008-09: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	2008-09: 2008-09: 6th Grade 33.1%, 8th Grade 24.2%, 10th Grade 30.4%, 12th Grade 27.5%		
				2009-10: 2009-10: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	2009-10: 2009-10 The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%			
				2011-12: 2011-12: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%			
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Perceived risk of Drug Use"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2009			6th Grade 19.5% 8th Grade 20.2% 10th Grade 16.8% 12th Grade 23.6%	2003

Comments: Previous reporting years explain the SHARP Survey and changes. Please note that the data from 2009-10 is the same as was reported in 2008-09. We are preparing for the 2011 SHARP Survey and those results will be reported on next year's report.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 2007-08: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%,			

				Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%	2007-08: 2007-08: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.8%, Tobacco 0.7%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.1%, 8th Grade Alcohol 8.7%, Tobacco 3.4%, Marijuana 2.4%, Inhalants 3.3%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 7.6%, Marijuana 6.5%, Inhalants 2.2%, 12th Grade Alcohol 19.0%, Tobacco 9.7%, Marijuana 7.4%, Inhalant 1.7%		
				2008-09: 200-09: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%,	2008-09: 2008-09: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.3%, Tobacco 1.2%, Marijuana 0.4%, Inhalants 1.9%, 8th Grade Alcohol 6.6%, Tobacco 4.1%, Marijuana 3.2%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 12.9%, Tobacco 8.7%, Marijuana 7.4%, Inhalants 1.9%, 12th Grade Alcohol 17.1%, Tobacco 12.0%, Marijuana 8.0%,		

Inhalants 1.0%	Inhalants 1.1%
2009-10: 200-10: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%	2009-10: 2009-2010 The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.
2010-11: 201-11: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%,	

				Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%			
				2011-12: 201-12: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%		6th Grade Alcohol 1.9%, Tobacco 1.4%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 3.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 8.6%, Tobacco 3.7%, Marijuana 2.9%, Inhalants 5.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 6.9%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.3%, 12th Grade Alcohol 21.1%, Tobacco 11.4%, Marijuana 10.0%, Inhalants 2.4%	
Decrease the percentage of students reporting "30 day use of ATODs"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2009				2003

Comments: We are pleased with the results of our prevention efforts in decreasing 30 day Alcohol use. Due to the extra effort put on Underage Drinking we see that the Alcohol 30 Day use has gone done in each area. We are seeing some slight increases in tobacco and marijuana use. However, at the levels we are currently prevention efforts are being successful in holding the use rate steady. With the forthcoming 2011 SHARP Survey we will be anxious to see if the positive results continue.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	38	106
6 through 8	28	106
9 through 12	20	106
Comments: Additional Charter Schools have come on since previous reporting period. Numbers reflect what LEAs are reporting on the online collection system. Some grades which were part of elementary schools may now be part of middle school from previous year.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	106
6 through 8	N<10	106
9 through 12	N<10	106
Comments: Additional Charter Schools have come on since previous reporting period. Numbers reflect what LEAs are reporting on the online collection system. Some grades which were part of elementary schools may now be part of middle school from previous year.		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	18	106
6 through 8	19	106
9 through 12	N<10	106
Comments: Additional Charter Schools have come on since previous reporting period. Numbers reflect what LEAs are reporting on the online collection system. Some grades which were part of elementary schools may now be part of middle school from previous year. This is the second year of collecting this data and number are lower than previous year by quite a bit. We continue to work with districts in improving reliability of incidents and data reporting.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	106
6 through 8	N<10	106
9 through 12	N<10	106
Comments: Additional Charter Schools have come on since previous reporting period. Numbers reflect what LEAs are reporting on the online collection system. Some grades which were part of elementary schools may now be part of middle school from previous year. This is the second year of collecting this data and numbers are lower than previous year by quite a bit. We continue to work with districts in improving reliability of incidents and data reporting.		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	280	106
6 through 8	207	106
9 through 12	117	106
Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents.		

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	106
6 through 8	N<10	106
9 through 12	N<10	106
Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents.		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	10	106
6 through 8	106	106
9 through 12	242	106
Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. Data is quite similar as last year in this category.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	106
6 through 8	N<10	106
9 through 12	N<10	106
Comments: Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. Data is the same as last year in this category.		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	41	106
6 through 8	538	106
9 through 12	727	106
Comments: Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. Data is quite different than previous year so we will keep our eye on these to see if we can become more consistent in the reporting process.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	106
6 through 8	11	106
9 through 12	11	106
Comments: Comments: Comments: Due to an increase in charter schools we are having more districts report than in years past. We continue to work on the definitions of incidents and consistency of reporting these incidents. Data is quite different than previous year so we will keep our eye on these to see if we can become more consistent in the reporting process.		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah is in the fifth year of the Parents Empowered effort. This is a statewide media campaign which is focused on parent/child communication about alcohol and is aimed at reducing underage alcohol use. This is a joint effort between the USOE, the Division of Substance Abuse, Division of Highway Safety, Division of Alcohol Beverage Control, MADD, the Attorney General's Office, Utah Crime Council, Department of Health and the Local Substance Abuse Prevention Providers. Our media partners (R& R Partners) lead out in this successful campaign. If you will notice our data on use rates that was part of our performance measures continues to decline. This is due to a comprehensive prevention effort throughout our state including the Parents Empowered Campaign because we see the very important role of parent involvement in the prevention effort. Our First Lady Mrs. Herbert has as part of her initiative the goal of getting parents involved as well and using high school students to be peer mentors when it comes to prevention efforts. This partnership with the First Lady is exciting and should assist in the continue prevention efforts. Because of the Prevention Network System in our state more and more Community Coalitions are coming on board and effectively deal with the issues they are faced with in their communities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah does not participate in RLIS.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2009-10?	_____No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	1
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2010 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)		
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	356.00	
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	436.00	
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		792.00
Total	792.00	792.00
Comments:		

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