

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended in 2001</p>	
<p>Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12                      <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12</p>	
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:          Utah State Office of Education</p>	
<p>Address:          250 East 500 South, PO Box 144200          Salt Lake City, UT 84114</p>	
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>	
<p>Name: Michelle Davis</p>	
<p>Telephone: 801-538-7515</p>	
<p>Fax: 801-538-7768</p>	
<p>e-mail: michelle.davis@schools.utah.gov</p>	
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):          Brenda Hales</p>	
<p>_____</p>	<p>Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 1:23:43 PM</p>
<p>Signature</p>	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2013-2014	2013-2014	2013-2014

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Not Applicable

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2013-2014	2013-2014	2013-2014
Regular Assessments in High School	2013-2014	2013-2014	2013-2014
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters  
 Not Applicable

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

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2013-2014	2013-2014	2013-2014
Regular Assessments in High School	2013-2014	2013-2014	2013-2014
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters  
 Not Applicable

### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

#### 1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	100.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	0.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	307,450	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,686	>=99
Asian	S	5,483	>=99
Black or African American	S	4,164	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	47,178	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	4,754	>=99
White	S	238,113	>=99
Two or more races	S	4,072	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	40,008	>=99
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	S	16,548	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	122,668	>=99
Migratory students	S	489	>=99
Male	S	157,254	>=99
Female	S	150,196	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,581	28.95
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,042	62.59
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,385	8.46
Total	40,008	////////////////////////////////////
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Utah does not offer the following:                      Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards                      Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards</p>		

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

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

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Participating</b>
All students	S	311,435	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,728	>=99
Asian	S	5,523	>=99
Black or African American	S	4,211	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	47,615	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	4,800	>=99
White	S	241,450	>=99
Two or more races	S	4,108	>=99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	41,298	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	16,480	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	124,129	>=99
Migratory students	S	483	>=99
Male	S	159,537	>=99
Female	S	151,898	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	
--	--

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

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

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

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,362	29.93
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,495	61.73
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,441	8.33
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	41,298	////////////////////
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Utah does not offer the following:                      Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards                      Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards</p>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	261,040	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	3,107	>=99
Asian	S	4,789	>=99
Black or African American	S	3,545	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	39,650	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	4,014	>=99
White	S	202,487	>=99
Two or more races	S	3,448	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	33,375	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	13,403	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	102,793	>=99
Migratory students	S	419	>=99
Male	S	133,802	>=99
Female	S	127,238	>=99

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,243	27.69
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,248	63.66
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,884	8.64
Total	33,375	////////////////////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Utah does not offer the following:  
 Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards  
 Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	47,662	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	579	S	50
Asian	822	S	77
Black or African American	643	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	7,605	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	747	S	62
White	36,626	S	81
Two or more races	640	S	77
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,033	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,168	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	20,181	S	66
Migratory students	72	S	50
Male	24,301	S	77
Female	23,361	S	76
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	47,670	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	579	S	58
Asian	802	S	80
Black or African American	640	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	7,576	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	744	S	68
White	36,689	S	83
Two or more races	640	S	80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,091	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,109	S	41
Economically disadvantaged students	20,206	S	69
Migratory students	71	S	56
Male	24,331	S	76
Female	23,339	S	82
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	S	S	N<
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino	S	S	N<
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	S	N<
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	S	N<
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	S	N<
Economically disadvantaged students	S	S	N<
Migratory students			
Male	S	S	N<
Female	S	S	N<
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This reflects out-of-level testing. Utah does not administer a third grade science CRT.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	46,332	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	525	S	58
Asian	792	S	80
Black or African American	669	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	7,333	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	704	S	68
White	35,692	S	83
Two or more races	617	S	79
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,063	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,105	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	19,454	S	68
Migratory students	72	S	51
Male	23,742	S	78
Female	22,590	S	78
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	46,302	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	524	S	56
Asian	771	S	80
Black or African American	663	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	7,325	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	707	S	69
White	35,695	S	83
Two or more races	617	S	79
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,061	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,058	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	19,430	S	69
Migratory students	69	S	58
Male	23,719	S	75
Female	22,583	S	82
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	46,381	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	523	S	37
Asian	794	S	63
Black or African American	670	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	7,352	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	706	S	47.
White	35,719	S	75
Two or more races	617	S	69
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,078	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,115	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	19,491	S	53
Migratory students	72	S	40
Male	23,771	S	69
Female	22,610	S	66
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,770	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	561	S	53
Asian	805	S	82
Black or African American	665	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	7,055	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	698	S	69
White	35,395	S	83
Two or more races	591	S	79
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,770	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,645	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	18,920	S	68
Migratory students	77	S	53
Male	23,348	S	78
Female	22,422	S	78
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,745	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	561	S	60
Asian	787	S	82
Black or African American	661	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	7,041	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	691	S	69
White	35,412	S	85
Two or more races	592	S	81
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,772	S	50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,592	S	34
Economically disadvantaged students	18,891	S	71
Migratory students	75	S	63
Male	23,339	S	78
Female	22,406	S	83
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,818	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	561	S	46
Asian	805	S	71
Black or African American	666	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	7,069	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	696	S	52
White	35,431	S	80
Two or more races	590	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,784	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,648	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	18,960	S	60
Migratory students	77	S	43
Male	23,387	S	75
Female	22,431	S	73
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,456	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	534	S	48
Asian	837	S	81
Black or African American	598	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	6,970	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	702	S	69
White	35,211	S	81
Two or more races	604	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,338	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,248	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	18,522	S	64
Migratory students	86	S	44
Male	23,165	S	75
Female	22,291	S	77
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of migrant students tested is higher than the student enrolled (1.10) due to LEAs incorrectly flagging migrant students. The USOE uses a separate database to track eligibility of migrant students. The data in 1.10 is correct as reported.			
The increase in two or more races is correct. The increase in LEP is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,471	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	535	S	59
Asian	824	S	81
Black or African American	595	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	6,958	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	701	S	74
White	35,253	S	85
Two or more races	605	S	80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,357	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,205	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	18,503	S	72
Migratory students	84	S	57
Male	23,165	S	78
Female	22,306	S	84
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of migrant students tested is higher than the student enrolled (1.10) due to LEAs incorrectly flagging migrant students. The USOE uses a separate database to track eligibility of migrant students. The data in 1.10 is correct as reported.			
The increase in two or more races is correct. The increase in LEP is correct.			

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	45,525	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	533	S	45
Asian	840	S	72
Black or African American	601	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	6,977	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	704	S	53
White	35,262	S	80
Two or more races	608	S	71
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,370	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,247	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	18,555	S	61
Migratory students	85	S	41
Male	23,212	S	76
Female	22,313	S	72

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of migrant students tested is higher than the student enrolled (1.10) due to LEAs incorrectly flagging migrant students. The USOE uses a separate database to track eligibility of migrant students. The data in 1.10 is correct as reported.

The increase in two or more races is correct.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	43,738	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	523	S	59
Asian	761	S	81
Black or African American	597	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	6,674	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	674	S	66
White	33,869	S	85
Two or more races	640	S	80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,010	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,208	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	17,380	S	69
Migratory students	68	S	60
Male	22,402	S	79
Female	21,336	S	81
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	44,322	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	526	S	63
Asian	758	S	83
Black or African American	609	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	6,722	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	688	S	78
White	34,372	S	88
Two or more races	647	S	85
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,372	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,205	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	17,574	S	75
Migratory students	67	S	52
Male	22,728	S	81
Female	21,594	S	88
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	44,059	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	522	S	45
Asian	772	S	73
Black or African American	607	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	6,693	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	676	S	56
White	34,146	S	81
Two or more races	643	S	74
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,227	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,219	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	17,464	S	61
Migratory students	69	S	30
Male	22,572	S	75
Female	21,487	S	75
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	39,716	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	458	S	41
Asian	725	S	72
Black or African American	503	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	5,948	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	612	S	58
White	30,958	S	75
Two or more races	512	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,517	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,873	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	15,185	S	55
Migratory students	61	S	56
Male	20,290	S	68
Female	19,426	S	70
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data are correct as reported.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,970	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	535	S	74
Asian	796	S	87
Black or African American	551	S	77
Hispanic or Latino	6,481	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	658	S	87
White	33,411	S	93
Two or more races	538	S	91
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,963	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,969	S	48
Economically disadvantaged students	16,561	S	83
Migratory students	66	S	70
Male	22,100	S	88
Female	20,870	S	93
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,780	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	525	S	43
Asian	809	S	70
Black or African American	557	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	6,459	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	659	S	57
White	33,233	S	80
Two or more races	538	S	76
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,825	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,996	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	16,453	S	59
Migratory students	66	S	42
Male	21,982	S	74
Female	20,798	S	73
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	38,776	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	506	S	38
Asian	741	S	69
Black or African American	489	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	5,593	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	617	S	53
White	30,362	S	69
Two or more races	468	S	64
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,277	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,301	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	13,026	S	49
Migratory students	53	S	40
Male	20,006	S	63
Female	18,770	S	64

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Multiple USOE staff have checked the SQL code that was used to extract this data and compared it with last year's code. The numbers of students tested are closely aligned with the Reading Language Arts and we believe that these data are correct. In comparing 2011 data with 2012 data at the LEA level, nearly all of the large increases AND similarly dramatic decreases occur in charter schools, which are LEAs in Utah. The reason for these shifts is unclear at this time.

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	38,955	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	468	S	72
Asian	785	S	83
Black or African American	492	S	70
Hispanic or Latino	5,512	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	611	S	82
White	30,618	S	92
Two or more races	469	S	93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,682	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,342	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	12,964	S	80
Migratory students	51	S	65
Male	20,155	S	87
Female	18,800	S	91

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,472	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	443	S	35
Asian	769	S	63
Black or African American	444	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	5,099	S	40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	573	S	42
White	28,692	S	73
Two or more races	452	S	71
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,087	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,177	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	11,868	S	52
Migratory students	50	S	34
Male	18,875	S	69
Female	17,597	S	65
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in two or more races is correct.			

## 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,022	717	70.16
Districts	126	29	23.02

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Because of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver granted to Utah, the AYP accountability system was replaced and no schools were identified as making or not making AYP based on the 2011-2012 school year assessment.

### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	277	192	69.31
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	209	140	66.99
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	68	52	76.47

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Because of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver granted to Utah, the AYP accountability system was replaced and no schools were identified as making or not making AYP based on the 2011-2012 school year assessment.

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
92	28	30.43

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Because of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver granted to Utah, the AYP accountability system was replaced and no schools were identified as making or not making AYP based on the 2011-2012 school year assessment.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 201-2012 school year, Utah had no Title I schools in Corrective Action based on 2010-2011 assessments.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 201-2012 school year, Utah had no Title I schools in Restructuring based on 2010-2011 assessments.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

All districts identified for improvement must complete the district improvement plan and reserve 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development to address the reason(s) for which the LEA was identified in need of improvement. Districts in the first two years of LEA improvement are also strongly encouraged to use the appraisal system described below. There were two districts identified for Corrective Action in 2011-12, that is, those districts that have been identified for improvement for three consecutive years, must use the appraisal system and support teams.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	2
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

<b>Entity</b>	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Because of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver granted to Utah, the AYP accountability system has been replaced. School and district AYP determinations have been eliminated based on the 2011-2012 assessment results.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	N/A
---	-----

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00%

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Reading Achievement funds

Title III support funds Title

VII support funds Common

Core Academy Principals'

Literacy Academy

Principals' Mathematics Academy

Coaching Institutes

Enhancement for At-risk Students

Early Intervention

funds STAR Tutoring

program Trust Land

funds

Title II A

Migrant Funds for Title I schools

21st Century Community Learning Centers

All of the above funding streams allowed schools, including schools in improvement, receiving those funds to focus on student achievement in a very targeted manner and enhance the learning opportunities for students. These funds supported teachers with professional development, trained parents in tutoring so they could assist their students, and offered additional learning time for students through before and after school programs, summer schools, and optional extended day kindergarten classes. Administrators also received additional professional development through the Principals' Literacy Institute, the Principals' Mathematics Institute, the Principals' Data Institute, or the Title I Principals' Leadership Institute in order to be more effective instructional leaders.

## 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

#### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	9,068
Applied to transfer	17
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	17
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 36,732

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

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

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - o Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - o Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - o Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.
---

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	389
Applied for supplemental educational services	210
Received supplemental educational services	208
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 153,621
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

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

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

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	98,478	83,347	84.64	15,131	15.36
All elementary classes	14,077	13,236	94.03	841	5.97
All secondary classes	84,401	70,111	83.07	14,290	16.93

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah counts elementary classes such that each full-day self-contained classroom counts as one class.

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	30.50
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.50
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	57.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	39.60
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	40.40
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	2,993	2,869	95.86
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,938	3,680	93.45
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	15,411	12,590	81.69
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	20,184	17,700	87.69

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	59.70	25.80
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	
Secondary schools	47.80	23.90
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment.	

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

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	38,401
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	37,154
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	31,275
Tonga (Tonga Islands)	905
Navajo; Navaho	812
Vietnamese	471
Somali	469

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	34,375
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,026
Total	38,401

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Utah's ELL count reflected in section 1.6.2.1 is based on yearlong unduplicated ELL student enrollment. The count of students reflected in section 1.6.3.1.1 (number participating in USOE's LEP assessment UALPA) is the number of ELL students enrolled during the spring 2012 assessment period. Utah's ELL student population's documented high mobility is a known contributing factor to the difference between the unduplicated yearlong count of ELL students and the count of students identified eligible to be tested in late spring. The discrepancy is within our predicted margins. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's identified and enrolled ELL population.

Data analysis provides the following information on the status of students not tested:

Transferred to Adult Education 2%  
 Dropout 5%  
 Transferred out of the country 7%  
 Transferred within the LEA 36%  
 Transfer out of State 17%  
 Transferred to another regular school LEA within the State 26%  
 Unknown 2%  
 Others 6%

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

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	21,116
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	63.11
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	33,225
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,929
Total	37,154
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Utah's ELL count reflected in section 1.6.2.1 is based on yearlong unduplicated ELL student enrollment. The count of students reflected in section 1.6.3.2.1 (number participating in USOE's LEP assessment UALPA) is the number of ELL students enrolled during the spring 2012 assessment period. Utah's ELL student population's documented high mobility is a known contributing factor to the difference between the unduplicated yearlong count of ELL students and the count of students identified eligible to be tested in late spring. The discrepancy is within our predicted margins. If compared to students who were enrolled and present to test, data shows that USOE is testing over 95% of Utah's identified and enrolled ELL population.</p> <p>Further data analysis of students not tested provides the following status information:</p> <p>Transferred to Adult Education 2%  Dropout 5%  Transferred out of the country 7%  Transferred within the LEA 36%  Transfer out of State 17%  Transferred to another regular school LEA within the State 26%  Unknown 2%  Others 6%</p>	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	7,598

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	3,510	13.70	23,610	40.00

Attained proficiency	20,203	60.81	16,882	28.60
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Utah does not administer assessments in languages other than English	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
English
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

<b>Language(s)</b>
English
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

<b>Language(s)</b>
English
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
8,859	4,235	13,094

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9,117	S	70	S

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9,153	S	82	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,600	S	54	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>	<b>#</b>
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	59
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	26
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	59
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	59
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	27
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	7
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of consortia members are included and counted in the total number of subgrantees. Each consortia member is included in the counts of subgrantees who have met/not met Title III AMAOs. Utah counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,541	455	10

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	442
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	52

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	//////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	40	//////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	40	//////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	43	//////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	38	//////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	//////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	//////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	16	136
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	15	217
PD provided to principals	40	507
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	36	45
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	4	15
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	16
Total	116	936

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/06/11	5
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has shortened the distribution of Title III funds by making them available to Subgrantees five days after the State receives the allocation. Funds are distributed as soon as the subgrantees submit an approved Title III application and reimbursement request. Funds are available from 7/01/2011 to 9/30/2013.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

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

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
LEAs without subgrants	126	32
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	136	42
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Forty-two (42) of the 136 LEAs in the Total row reported having homeless students in their attendance during the program year reported.		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24	77
K	265	765
1	353	872
2	388	832
3	364	883
4	348	839
5	334	839
6	313	786
7	293	747
8	311	688
9	212	656
10	159	644
11	170	595
12	152	688
Ungraded		
Total	3,686	9,911

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No ungraded homeless students were reported for this reporting period. The data is accurate as reported.

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

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

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	84	457
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,362	8,808
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	153	435
Hotels/Motels	87	211
Total	3,686	9,911

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	179
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	77
K	765
1	872
2	832
3	883
4	839
5	839
6	786
7	747
8	688
9	656
10	644
11	595
12	688
Ungraded	0
Total	10,090
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no ungraded students reported for this category for this reporting period. The data is accurate as reported.	

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	
Migratory children/youth	27
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,909
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,502
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,308	795
4	1,210	723
5	1,191	761
6	1,140	732
7	1,068	712
8	996	734
High School	716	520

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,308	725
4	1,214	724
5	1,198	722
6	1,147	613
7	1,047	628
8	926	397
High School	750	287

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4	1,221	544
5	1,208	646
6	1,147	594
7	1,047	520
8	994	474
High School	664	286

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

- a. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.
- b. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	147
K	111
1	100
2	98
3	87
4	75
5	93
6	81
7	76
8	66
9	61
10	60
11	43
12	42
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	15
Total	1,156

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of migrant students tested as reported in 1.3 is high than the students enrolled due to LEAs incorrectly flagging migrant students. The data in 1.10 is correct as reported.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are fewer families arriving to do qualifying work in Utah from other previous sending states as well as from Mexico, where traditionally a large portion of our migrant families have come. More students are reaching the end of their 36 month eligibility.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	71
K	65
1	54
2	59
3	53
4	49
5	55
6	45
7	28
8	20
9	23
10	21
11	11
12	8
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	563

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No ungraded migrant students were reported for this reporting period.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As the Utah MEP continues to review and revise its Comprehensive Needs Assessment and subsequent Service Delivery Plan, LEAs change the times and methods they use to more efficiently and effectively provide instructional services to migrant students. This program year, LEA MEPs provided far fewer services during the summer intersession and therefore fewer students were identified for this data field.

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: The system that Utah used for the 2011/2012 school year reporting period is the Migrant Achievement and Performance System (MAPS), [www.ertcmaps.com](http://www.ertcmaps.com).

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

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

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1: Utah MEP child count data were collected by LOA/MEP recruiters by way of paper copies of National Certificates of Eligibility (COEs). All interviews are conducted face to face. The data elements collected through the National COE are as follows: The School District, Program Year, Male Guardian's Name, Female Guardian's Name, Current Address, Student's Unique Migrant State Student Identification Number, Student's Name, Student's Sex, Student's Birth Date, Birth Date Verification Code, Residency Date, Grade, School Building Number, Qualifying Work Information (i.e., moved from, QAD, type of qualifying work, verification of temporary work), Guardian Signature, Signature of Interviewer, Signature of Designated LOA Reviewer, Signature of Designated SEA Reviewer. The National COEs are signed by parents/guardians and by the interviewer/recruiter. The COEs are then reviewed by LOA/ MEP Directors and approved. Once approved, COE data are entered by the LOA into the online MAPS data collection system, at which point the SEA/MEP Director reviews and approves or declines each COE that has been submitted. Each COE that is declined is returned electronically to the LEA for re-interview and re-submission of a new and corrected COE for SEA review and approval or decline.

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

3: Category 1 and 2 data are collected and maintained through the same set of procedures. For all eligible migrant students, data is reported by the LOA individually for each student in the MAPS system. A field labeled, "Student Data" requires the LOA to select from a drop down box the following enrollment options: Regular Term, Summer/Intercession, Year Round, Residency Only. Only one enrollment type may be selected and each student's enrollment is tied to his/her SSID number and can only be counted and reported once. A second check box requires LOAs to check if each student received services during the Category 1 Regular Term, the Category 2 Summer Term, or Both. Again, the data is reported for each eligible migrant student individually and is tied to his/her unique SSID number. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of September of each year. Once again, the enrollment boxes and services provided boxes in MAPS are reviewed and updated at the end of each program year by the LOA to include data specifically regarding participation in a Summer/Intercession program. This data is reported throughout the program year, but reviewed by the LOA and ultimately the SEA at the end of the program year for every student.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data are entered into the online MAPS system by LOA/MEP staff after the paper copies of National COEs have been submitted to LOA/MEP Directors for approval. LOA/MEP personnel input the student data and update changes in the MAPS system as needed. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of May (regular school year) each year and before the end of September of each year. The MAPS system automatically organizes this information disaggregated by district as well as aggregated for the whole state MEP.

A unique SSID number is created for all eligible migrant students in Utah ages 3 - 21. This number is entered by LOA/MEP staff into the MAPS/MEP system. Every student's SSID number is also reported by the LOA into the State Data Warehouse for general school enrollment purposes. At the end of each MEP program year, SSID numbers from MAPS and corresponding data are coordinated with SSID numbers and data from the Utah Data Warehouse. These data are combined into a master Migrant Education file for review. Where duplicate names, similar names, or suspect data exist in the file, corresponding COEs are retrieved from MAPS and electronically returned to its LOA of origin for clarification. Once clarification regarding any possible duplication has occurred, then duplicate records are eliminated from the master Migrant Education data file as well as from MAPS and the Utah Data Warehouse.

At the end of each program year and after data review between the Utah Data Warehouse and MAPS, all COEs in the MAPS system are moved within the system under the to the "Needs Updated" file. For the upcoming program year, each COE in the "Needs Updated" file must be reviewed, updated, and resubmitted to the SEA for approval. It is the Utah MEP practice to re-interview each family each program year to ensure the students' continued eligibility in the program. Students who have

been found to be ineligible through re-interview have their COE moved from the "Needs Updated" file in MAPS to the "COE Withdrawn" file. This process is the same for both Category I and Category II counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

N/A

---

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Child count data are entered into the online MAPS system by LOA/MEP staff after the paper copies of National COEs have been submitted to LOA/MEP Directors for approval. LOA/MEP personnel input the student data and update changes in the MAPS system as needed. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of May (regular school year) each year and before the end of October (Summer Program, unduplicated count) each year. The MAPS system automatically organizes this information disaggregated by district as well as aggregated for the whole state MEP. Each eligible migrant student whose information has been entered into MAPS.

A unique SSID number is created for all eligible migrant students in Utah ages 3 - 21. This number is entered by LOA/MEP staff into the MAPS/MEP system. Every student's SSID number is also reported by the LOA into the State Data Warehouse for general school enrollment purposes. At the end of each MEP program year, SSID numbers from MAPS and corresponding data are coordinated with SSID numbers and data from the Utah Data Warehouse. These data are combined into a master Migrant Education file for review. Where duplicate names, or similar names exist in the file, corresponding COEs are retrieved from MAPS and electronically returned to its LOA of origin for clarification. Once clarification regarding any possible duplication has occurred, then duplicate records are eliminated from the master Migrant Education data file as well as from MAPS and the Utah Data Warehouse.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Category 1(regular term) and 2 (summer/ intersession) data are collected and maintained through the same set of procedures. All data are reviewed by the SEA Migrant Education Director in Coordination with the Data Warehouse personnel and the EDEN Administration. For all eligible migrant students, data is reported by the LEA individually for each student in the MAPS system. A field labeled, "Student Data" requires the LEA to select from a drop down box the following enrollment options: Regular Term, Summer/Intercession, Year Round, Residency Only. Only one enrollment type may be selected and each student's enrollment is tied to his/her SSID number and can only be counted and reported once. A second check box requires LEAs to check if each student received services during the Category 1 Regular Term, the Category 2 Summer Term, or Both. Again, the data is reported for each eligible migrant student individually and is tied to his/her unique SSID number. Every National COE in the MAPS system must be updated before the end of September for each year. Once again, the enrollment boxes and services provided boxes in MAPS are reviewed and updated at the end of each program year by the LOA to include data specifically regarding participation in a Summer/Intercession program. This data is reported throughout the program year, but reviewed by the LEA and ultimately the SEA at the end of the program year for every student.

The SEA conducts at least one state wide ID&R training annually for Migrant Education records/data entry personnel. As part of the training records/data entry personnel are trained how to review both regular term site records and summer/inter-session site records. They are taught to input data and run reports used for child count purposes.

The SEA conducts at least one state wide ID&R training for Migrant Education recruiters. The purpose of this training is to evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and to revise recruitment efforts. The content of this training is based on the results of the Prospective Re-Interview that the Utah MEP conducts EVERY PROGRAM YEAR as well as from data entered in the MAPS data system. Eligibility training is directed by the verbiage in Non Regulatory Guidance, the National ID&R Curriculum and the Utah Migrant Education Recruiter's Manual. MAPS data entry training is based on the MAPS User's Guide. All training materials are available on the Utah State Office of Education Website. Additional and ongoing training on ID&R and data entry topics is available through webinar and LEA onsite trainings.

The SEA reviews eligibility documentation as part of regular monitoring. Every program year all LEAs must complete the online desktop monitoring instrument (DMI). As part of the desktop monitoring, multiple samples of current paper-copy COEs must be scanned into the system for review by the SEA. Every other year, each LEA must participate in an onsite monitoring visit conducted by the SEA. Again, multiple samples of the current program's COEs are provided and reviewed for consistency and accuracy. This is done also by the SEA to review how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2011/2012 program year, the Utah MEP conducted a Prospective Re-interview following the protocol as instructed in the Federal Regulations SEC. 200.89(b)(2).

In order to achieve a 95 percent confidence level with a plus/minus 5 percent error rate, a random sample of at least 280 students from 2011-2012 was needed. However, even though sampling was based on students who were still current residents there would be a significant percentage of families and students not available during the re-interview process. Therefore, the Sampling Plan had to take into account sampling with replacement. The simplest and most straight forward way of doing this was to increase the sample size based on our expectation regarding the contact rate. Our estimation of the contact rate was 50 percent. By dividing the sample size (N=280) by .50 and adding that percent to the total created a new sample size of 420. The number of students selected through the random sampling process in order to allow for miscontacts and ultimately obtain 280 responses was 420. The audit interviewer (Mr. Keith Grover) were required to attempt to contact each family a minimum of three times before eliminating a family from the sample as not available. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to generate the random sample. SPSS was instructed to select a simple random sample of 420 students from the master list of 2011-2012 migrant students still enrolled in Utah schools (N= 1033). Once the sample was drawn, students were organized into districts to facilitate the re-interviewing process. The audit interviewer visited each district and contacted as many available families as possible. The interviewer contacted each family three times (when possible) before crossing a student off the sample list as unavailable. However, it is important to note that time constraints affected the re-interviewers ability to re-contact some families. In addition, some families refused to provide information to the re-interviewer.

The audit interviewer indicated on the interview protocol whether each individual student from the sample was eligible or ineligible for migrant services for 2011-2012 based on the structured interview of the family representative. The audit interviewers used the OME guidance from October 2010 to ascertain student eligibility depending on the date of initial qualification. The project coordinator then reviewed all the results of the written interview protocols in relation to the original Certificates of Eligibility from 2011-2012. The project coordinator then supported or contested the audit interviewer's judgment regarding student eligibility. Finally, the Utah State Migrant Director reviewed the forms and the findings so that an agreement by three distinct reviewers facilitated the validity of the process. In addition, each of the reviewers was asked to identify any other issues (e.g. intentional fraud, high defect rates from certain recruiters, etc.) that were of importance to note and help to clarify recruitment identification and eligibility issues for the state of Utah. A record of each interview protocol, the independent judgments and comments of each reviewer (i.e., audit interviewers, project coordinator, and state director) is available and will be maintained for review at the Utah Department of Education. There were no discrepancies found during the review process (i.e. the audit interviewer, the project coordinator, and the state migrant director all agreed on eligibility or non-eligibility for each student in the sample.

The defect rate is based on the percentage of the sample that was judged to be not eligible for migrant services in 2011-2012. This defect rate is based on the completed sample and provides results in line with OME guidance at the 95 percent confidence level with a standard error of plus or minus 5 percent (assuming the legitimacy of the sample). The purpose of sampling is to enable a generalization from the sample population to the total population of 1033 migrant students who were deemed eligible in 2011-2012.

Using a simple calculation (proportion of migrant students in the sample who were found to be ineligible for migrant services in 2011-2012), the defect rate for the Utah State Migrant Education Program for 2011-2012 based on the sample is: .4%

The Utah audit of Migrant Child Eligibility for 2011-2012 was completed over the agreed upon contract period by Educational Research and Training Corporation. The defect rate for the sample was found to be .4 % statewide. The defect rate was a total of 1 ineligible student form a sample population of 249.

It was clear from the data that the state and all Utah migrant programs are doing an exceptional job of ensuring that only eligible migrant families and students are identified and approved.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has written procedures to ensure that child count data are inputted and updated (MAPS User's Manual). LEAs are provided lists that are checked for accuracy and any changes to the lists are returned for data entry. The Utah MAPS system allows for constant quality management. The SEA, MEP staff checks each LEA's COE and migrant student data submission each Friday of the week during the entire duration of the program year. Any inaccuracies or problems are immediately corrected by correspondence with LEA/MEP staff.

Multiple times during the program year, MAPS and student data from the State Data Warehouse are uploaded and merged by way of matching SSID numbers and intense scrutiny of mismatches or inconsistencies of information from those data merges. MAPS data are uploaded to MSIX monthly.

The Utah MEP conducts a prospective reinterview EVERY PROGRAM YEAR using random samples to conduct audits of COEs. This prospective reinterview conducted EVERY PROGRAM YEAR, using random samples, includes audits of childcount records and data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

A unique SSID number is created for all eligible migrant students in Utah ages 3 - 21. This number is entered by LOA/MEP staff into the MAPS/MEP system. Every student's SSID number is also reported by the LOA into the State Data Warehouse for general school enrollment purposes. At the end of each MEP program year, SSID numbers from MAPS and corresponding data are coordinated with SSID numbers and data from the Utah Data Warehouse. These data are combined into a master Migrant Education file for review by the SEA. Where duplicate names, or similar names exist in the file, corresponding COEs are retrieved from MAPS and electronically returned to its LOA of origin for clarification. Once clarification regarding any possible duplication has occurred, then duplicate records are eliminated from the master Migrant Education data file as well as from MAPS and the Utah Data Warehouse.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Results from the 2011/2012 Prospective Re-interview were shared with each participating LEA in conjunction with a Utah State MEP, LEA Directors' meeting on November 16, 2012. There was only 1 error in the Prospective Reinterview and that student record was stricken from the Utah MEP rolls and migrant student counts. This change will impact the MEP subgrant to this LEA/MEP for the upcoming program year. this corrective action was a direct result of the prospective re-interview.

Improvements made to eligibility determinations lead to identification and recruitment improvements. Where ineligibility determinations were encountered, the LEA was required to demonstrate in writing how that student was taken off Migrant Education Program rolls. Also, LEAs are required to define corrective actions to eliminated future occurrences of similar

problems and recruiting mistakes. The SEA conducts at least one state wide ID&R training annually for Migrant Education recruiters and data entry personnel. The focus of these trainings are results from the Prospective Re-Interview and data entry for the MAPS data system. Eligibility training is based on the Non Regulatory Guidance, the National ID&R Curriculum and the Utah Migrant Education Recruiter's Manual. MAPS data entry training is based on the MAPS User's Guide. All training materials are available on the Utah State Office of Education Website. Additional and ongoing training on ID&R and data entry topics are available through webinar and LEA onsite trainings.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has no concerns at this time.