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

UTAH

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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
___Part I, 2011-12 _X_Part II, 2011-12

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Utah State Office of Education

Address:
250 East 500 South, PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Michelle Davis

Telephone: 801-538-7515

Fax: 801-538-7768

e-mail: michelle.davis@schools.utah.gov

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

_____ Wednesday, May 1, 2013, 4:57:38 PM
Signature

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	13,045	S	69
4	12,657	S	72
5	11,991	S	73
6	8,519	S	65
7	2,493	S	56
8	2,289	S	44
High School	684	S	52
Total	51,678	S	68
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	13,019	S	73
4	12,648	S	73
5	11,976	S	75
6	8,499	S	74
7	2,484	S	70
8	2,502	S	77
High School	641	S	82
Total	51,769	S	74
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	3,909	S	78
4	3,932	S	79
5	3,444	S	78
6	2,879	S	72
7	2,429	S	79
8	2,144	S	62
High School	973	S	58
Total	19,710	S	75
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	3,965	S	81
4	3,931	S	81
5	3,442	S	84
6	2,911	S	81
7	2,520	S	86
8	2,356	S	91
High School	1,026	S	91
Total	20,151	S	84
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	**# Students Served**
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	19,053
Limited English proficient students	21,074
Students who are homeless	7,614
Migratory students	515
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	**# Students Served**
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,528
Asian	2,359
Black or African American	2,871
Hispanic or Latino	40,943
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,804
White	77,391
Two or more races	1,775
Total	132,671
Comments: This data is not correct. We would like to request to be included in the limited reopening of Part II in order to correct it.	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	0	5,075	0	0	5,075
K	732	17,468	0	0	18,200
1	897	16,622	8	0	17,527
2	824	16,119	12	0	16,955
3	750	15,619	10	0	16,379
4	751	15,219	11	0	15,981
5	648	14,382	17	0	15,047
6	355	10,299	7	0	10,661
7	440	3,289	8	0	3,737
8	349	3,188	7	0	3,544
9	195	2,391	0	0	2,586
10	91	970	0	0	1,061
11	87	1,064	0	0	1,151
12	60	1,040	0	0	1,100
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	6,179	122,745	80	0	129,004
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,412
Reading/language arts	5,638
Science	307
Social studies	73
Vocational/career	41
Other instructional services	
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	30
Supporting guidance/advocacy	291
Other support services	
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	290	
Paraprofessionals[1]	147	99.90
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	24	
Clerical support staff	28	
Administrators (non-clerical)	29	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

1. What is a *"paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
   (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
   (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
   (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
   (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
   (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
   (6) Acting as a translator; or
   (7) Providing instructional services to students.
2. What is an GÇ£other paraprofessional?GÇ¥ Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
3. Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	433.80	99.10
Comments:		

2.1.4.1 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received an FY 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs*	74	20
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	65,490	1,028,879
Sum of LEAs' FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations	11,641,903	68,196,062
Percentage of LEA's FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.60	1.50

[1] *The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocation.In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.

LEAs reported using the Title I Parent Involvement set-aside for the following activities:
* Training activities (consultants, supplies, materials)
* Purchase of parent information resources
* Salaries/benefits for Title I parent liaisons
* Expenses for providing language translation for parent training activities
* Transportation and registration costs for parent participation in workshops/conferences
* Expenses related to family literacy activities

NOTE: The current consolidated grants management tool for Utah gathered the Title I Parental Involvement set-aside only for LEAs with Title I allocations of more than $500,000. The data for LEAs receiving Title I allocations of less than $500,000 is not complete. Future data collections will include the data for LEAs receiving less than $500,000.

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

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	0
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.	

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2011. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

Participating Groups	**# Participants**
1. Families participating	0
2. Adults participating	0
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	0
4. Participating children	0
a. Birth through 2 years	0
b. Ages 3 through 5	0
c. Ages 6 through 8	0
c. Above age 8	0
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.	

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

Enrolled families	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	0
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	0
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	0
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	0
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	0
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.	

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2012). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	0
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	0
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	0
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	0
5. Total families enrolled	0
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.	

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

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

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

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

Test	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	0		
CASAS	0		
Other	0		
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.			

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

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

Test	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	0		
CASAS	0		
BEST	0		
BEST Plus	0		
BEST Literacy	0		
Other	0		
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.			

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	0		
GED	0		
Other	0		
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.			

Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	0		
GED	0		
Other	0		
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.			

The following terms apply:

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

Language Development Measure	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	0				
PPVT-IV	0				
TVIP	0				
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.					

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

Language Development Measure	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	0				
PPVT-IV	0				
TVIP	0				
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.					

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

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2011 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

Letter Identification Measure	# Age-Eligible	#	#	Average Number of Letters	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	0				
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.					

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

The following terms apply:
1. "# in Cohort" includes school-aged children who have participated in Even Start for at least 6 months.

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	0		
1	0		
2	0		
3	0		
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.			

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

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

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

Measure of Parental Support	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	0		
PEP Scale II	0		
PEP Scale III	0		
PEP Scale IV	0		
Other	0		
Comments: The state of Utah received no Even Start funding for the 2011-2012 school year. No LEAs had Even Start programs.			

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	2
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	1,158
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	5
3	6
4	10
5	12
6	11
7	9
8	7
9	8
10	5
11	1
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	74
Comments: There are a larger number of students that are "settling out" of their 36 month eligibility for Migrant Education services. Because one of the categories of identification for priority for services is that the student had a qualifying move within the past 12 months, there are fewer students that can be considered priority for services.	

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	64
K	55
1	70
2	65
3	54
4	43
5	59
6	38
7	39
8	34
9	31
10	33
11	17
12	21
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	5
Total	629
Comments:	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	2
1	3
2	7
3	7
4	6
5	9
6	7
7	4
8	6
9	4
10	8
11	3
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	75

Comments: There were fewer migrant students identified as eligible for the Migrant Education Program this year than last. Also, many migrant students are "settling out" of their 36 month eligibility range. Former migrant students may have been identified has having a disability, but because they are no longer eligible for Migrant Education, they are not counted in this category.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2011. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within 12 Months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within Previous 13 – 24 Months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within Previous 25 – 36 Months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within Previous 37 – 48 Months from the last day of the reporting period
Age birth through 2		2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34	44	44	
K	27	36	26	
1	26	35	24	
2	18	28	28	
3	17	28	26	
4	14	26	21	
5	24	26	24	
6	12	27	15	
7	19	26	20	
8	5	24	17	
9	8	27	15	
10	14	14	17	
11	7	8	17	
12	5	15	16	
Ungraded			1	
Out-of-school	2	5	6	
Total	232	371	317	

Comments: *Data for the category, "Previous 37-48 Months" was not collected through the Utah Data Warehouse. This error has been documented and will be corrected when CSPR, Part II re-opens for corrects.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2011. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	36
K	44
1	50
2	46
3	49
4	42
5	58
6	54
7	54
8	43
9	38
10	36
11	32
12	23
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	8
Total	615
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	N<
Ungraded	
Total	N<
Comments: There were fewer students identified in the Migrant Education Program this program year, including student identified in grades 7 through 12. Therefore, there are fewer students identified that dropped out of school.	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2010-11 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	6
Comments: LEA/LOA MEPs' intention is to assist every eligible migrant student to graduate high school. This increase demonstrates provided services to help all eligible migrant students obtain a high school diploma	

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	71	71
4	69	69
5	75	75
6	84	84
7	67	67
8	67	66
HS	52	51
Total	485	483
Comments:		

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	72	72
4	72	72
5	77	77
6	87	86
7	68	68
8	62	61
HS	55	53
Total	493	489
Comments:		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	43
K	77
1	81
2	86
3	78
4	66
5	85
6	75
7	66
8	61
9	55
10	54
11	41
12	37
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	11
Total	917
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services- During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	
K	
1	0
2	0
3	4
4	5
5	12
6	7
7	10
8	4
9	5
10	9
11	3
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	59

Comments: Migrant student populations change constantly as well as MEP focus in identifying and providing for services to "priority for service" migrant students. It is reasonable to expect larger student counts, or smaller student counts for these grades (i.e., 7, 10, 3) as the student population changes.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	24
1	31
2	30
3	23
4	19
5	36
6	24
7	28
8	18
9	20
10	19
11	17
12	14
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2
Total	319

Comments: More Utah migrant students are reaching the end of their 36 month eligibility status (i.e., settling out)has caused a differentiation in total amounts of students in this category. LEAs/LOAs are providing more Continuation of Services (COS) to students that are settling out. The technical assistance provided to LOAs regarding COS is that they first meet the unique educational needs of PFS and other currently eligible students and that they follow the provisions of COS as outlined in the Non Regulatory Guidance (NRG) issued by OME. The NRG are discussed in statewide training and are available on the Utah State Office of Education's website.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten	29
K	77
1	81
2	86
3	78
4	66
5	85
6	75
7	66
8	61
9	55
10	54
11	41
12	37
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	11
Total	903
Comments: LEA/LOA MEPs' intention is to assist every eligible migrant student to achieve academic success in school. This increase demonstrates provided services to help all eligible migrant students to achieve that goal during the regular school year.	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	1	1	//////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	20	16	//////////////////////////////
K	55	44	//////////////////////////////
1	66	58	//////////////////////////////
2	67	61	//////////////////////////////
3	62	51	//////////////////////////////
4	50	48	//////////////////////////////
5	66	52	//////////////////////////////
6	56	47	//////////////////////////////
7	53	46	//////////////////////////////
8	49	40	//////////////////////////////
9	47	42	10
10	40	38	18
11	34	29	18
12	29	25	12
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	6	4	3
Total	701	602	61
Comments: There are no duplicate counts for students receiving an instructional service.			

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	21	2
K	21	1
1	40	
2	31	
3	34	1
4	27	
5	34	1
6	25	
7	35	2
8	22	4
9	33	4
10	24	11
11	20	10
12	18	6
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	1	1
Total	386	43

Comments: Each year the Utah MEP PAC meets to analyze the MEP evaluation. The PAC may choose to make adjustments to the SDP in order to better achieve the MEP goals and objectives. If those changes are made, they are shared with the LOAs in one of the statewide trainings, through webinars, by email, on the USOE web page and are required to be present for funding through the Utah Consolidated Application. The technical assistance provided to the LOA MEPs is that meet the goals of the Utah CNA and implement the service plans as defined by the Utah MEP SDP. However, as long as resources and funding allow, LOAs can identify additional strategies to eliminate barriers unique to their student population so that they can more effectively ensure their academic achievement. This year, some LOAs decided to implement fewer support services and counseling services.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18
K	44
1	52
2	57
3	50
4	44
5	51
6	42
7	25
8	20
9	23
10	20
11	11
12	8
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	466

Comments: Each year the Utah MEP PAC meets to analyze the MEP evaluation. The PAC may choose to make adjustments to the SDP in order to better achieve the MEP goals and objectives. If those changes are made, they are shared with the LOAs in one of the statewide trainings, through webinars, by email, on the USOE web page and are required to be present for funding through the Utah Consolidated Application. The technical assistance provided to the LOA MEPs is that meet the goals of the Utah CNA and implement the service plans as defined by the Utah MEP SDP. However, as long as resources and funding allow, LOAs can identify additional strategies to eliminate barriers unique to their student population so that they can more effectively ensure their academic achievement. This year, some LOAs decided to implement more referred services.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation- Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	1
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	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	564
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	
K	
1	
2	
3	4
4	5
5	10
6	3
7	6
8	1
9	2
10	5
11	2
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	38

Comments: Utah's "priority for service" definition places a greater emphasis on the mobility of migrant students within the pas 12 month period. The Utah MEP is experiencing larger numbers of migrant students who are reaching the end of their 36 month eligibility (i.e., settling out). Therefore, fewer students are being identified as being Priority for Service (i.e., those migrant students that were in the 11th grade).

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	15
1	21
2	20
3	23
4	20
5	23
6	23
7	15
8	12
9	9
10	9
11	3
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	210

Comments: More Utah migrant students are reaching the end of their 36 month eligibility status (i.e., settling out) has caused differentiation in total amounts of students in this category. LEAs/LOAs are providing more Continuation of Services (COS) to students that are settling out. The technical assistance provided to LOAs regarding COS is that they first meet the unique educational needs of PFS and other currently eligible students and that they follow the provisions of COS as outlined in the Non Regulatory Guidance issued by OME. The NRG are discussed in statewide training and are available on the Utah State Office of Education's website.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	70
K	64
1	54
2	57
3	52
4	48
5	54
6	44
7	28
8	20
9	22
10	19
11	11
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	551
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	1	1	//////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61	61	//////////////////////////////
K	51	51	//////////////////////////////
1	53	51	//////////////////////////////
2	57	57	//////////////////////////////
3	52	51	//////////////////////////////
4	47	45	//////////////////////////////
5	54	54	//////////////////////////////
6	43	43	//////////////////////////////
7	28	27	//////////////////////////////
8	20	20	//////////////////////////////
9	20	20	6
10	19	17	16
11	10	10	5
12	7	7	6
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	523	515	33

Comments: There are no duplicate counts for students receiving an instructional service. Each year the Utah MEP PAC meet to analyze the MEP evaluation. The PAC may choose to make adjustments to the SDP in order to better achieve the MEP goals and objectives. If those changes are made, they are shared with the LOAs in one of the statewide trainings, through webinars, by email, on the USOE web page and are required to be present for funding through the Utah Consolidated Application. The technical assistance provided to LOA MEPs is that they meet the goals of the Utah CNA and implement the service plans as defined by the Utah MEP SDP. However, as long as resources and funding allow, LOAs can identify additional strategies to eliminate barriers unique to their student population so that they can more effectively ensure their academic achievement. Additional technical assistance that has been provided to local MEPs regarding Summer MEPs is that they provide them if students are present during summer months, it will positively impact the academic achievement of PFS students and other migrant students, the LOA/PAC has requested it, and again, if there are sufficient resources and funding to implement them. During the summer intersession of this program year, it was determined that high school credit accrual services needed to be implemented.

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16	
K	17	1
1	19	
2	15	
3	27	1
4	17	
5	17	
6	15	
7	16	
8	4	1
9	8	3
10	9	3
11	2	1
12	2	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	1	
Total	185	10

Comments: Each program year the Utah MEP is subject to changes in the methods that services are delivered. This program year, more support services were implemented by the LOAs as a method to eliminate barriers to migrant student academic success. Because the structure and time frame of regular year MEP implementation is different from Summer MEPs. The technical assistance provided to LOA MEPs is that they meet the goals of the Utah CNA and implement the service plans as defined by the Utah MEP SDP. However, LOA can identify additional strategies to eliminate barriers unique to their student population so that they can more effectively ensure their academic achievement. Each year the Utah MEP PAC meets to analyze the MEP evaluation. The PAC may choose to make adjustments to the SDP in order to better achieve the MEP goals and objectives. If those changes are made, they are shared with the LOAs in one of the statewide trainings, through webinars, by email, on the USOE web page and are required to be present for funding through the Utah Consolidated Application.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	1
1	1
2	1
3	3
4	2
5	
6	1
7	
8	
9	2
10	1
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	16

Comments: Each program year the Utah MEP is subject to changes in the methods that services are delivered. This program year, more support services were implemented by the LOAs as a method to eliminate barriers to migrant student academic success. Because the structure and time frame of regular year MEP implementation is different from Summer MEPs. The technical assistance provided to LOA MEPs is that they meet the goals of the Utah CNA and implement the service plans as defined by the Utah MEP SDP. However, LOA can identify additional strategies to eliminate barriers unique to their student population so that they can more effectively ensure their academic achievement. Each year the Utah MEP PAC meets to analyze the MEP evaluation. The PAC may choose to make adjustments to the SDP in order to better achieve the MEP goals and objectives. If those changes are made, they are shared with the LOAs in one of the statewide trainings, through webinars, by email, on the USOE web page and are required to be present for funding through the Utah Consolidated Application.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	2
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	1,158
Comments:	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	142
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	920
Comments: More Utah migrant students are reaching the end of their 36 month eligibility status (i.e., settling out) has caused differentiation in total amounts of students in this category. Some LEAs/LOAs are providing Continuation of Services (COS) to students that are settling out, but some may have not counted these students in this category because they were determined to be ineligible for services at the end of the program year when this data was collected.	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: There were no schools identified where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program.	

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	74	375
Regular school year – school day/extended day	1	21
Summer/intersession only	32	476
Year round	74	465
Comments: There are fewer migrant students this program year than last, therefore there will be fewer students overall. Also, each year the Utah MEP PAC meets to analyze the MEP evaluation. The PAC may choose to make adjustments to the SDP in order to better achieve the MEP goals and objectives. If those changes are made, they are shared with the LOAs in one of the statewide trainings, through webinars, by email, on the USOE web page and are required to be present for funding through the Utah Consolidated Application. The technical assistance provided to LOA MEPs is that they meet the goals of the Utah CNA and implement the service plans as defined by the Utah MEP SDP. However, as long as resources and funding allow, LOAs can identify additional strategies to eliminate barriers unique to their student population so that they can more effectively ensure their academic achievement. Additional technical assistance that has been provided to local MEPs regarding Summer MEPs is that they provide them if students are present during summer months, it will positively impact the academic achievement of PFS students and other migrant students, the LOA/PAC has requested it, and again, if there are sufficient resources and funding to implement them.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	8	6	115	94
Counselors	0	0	1	0
All paraprofessionals	80	39	161	133
Recruiters	19	13	16	8
Records transfer staff	5	2	3	2
Administrators	8	2	3	3
Comments: The Utah MEP assesses and adjusts its Comprehensive Needs Assessment and subsequent Service Delivery Plan. LEAs/LOAs may determine that an increase, or decrease in MEP staff is warranted to best implement the program strategies as determined by the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Service Delivery Plan.				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

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

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

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

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

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

g. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year Headcount	Regular School Year FTE	Summer/Intersession Term Headcount	Summer/Intersession Term FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	51	19.80	84	61.60
Comments: As Utah MEP LEA/LOA programs continuously evaluate effective program strategies and plan in accordance with the Utah MEP Service Delivery Plan, when feasible, choose to fund additional staff time to ensure the academic success of its migrant students. This program year, some LEA/LOA MEPs have offered more Summer MEPs.				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students.

Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	8	10
Juvenile corrections	11	63
Adult corrections	2	365
Other	0	0
Total	21	

Comments: The State of Utah, with its goals in Part D to cause maximum impact for THE MOST A-RISK students, is in a two-stage evolution, making adjustments to its state plan beginning April 2012 and continuing through September 2014. The planning outcome will result in an eventual, purposeful, significant drop in eligible sites and enrollments with the potential of a gradual up-tick in eligible sites and enrollment numbers in following years.

Specific to this category, from last year to this year, the state criteria for eligible participation dropped from 26 sites to 21 sites (24% reduction). The impact, however, in numbers of eligible enrolled students, was a 57% drop, with 95% of the drop coming in formerly enrolled juvenile detention students. Nonetheless, juvenile detention students are being increasingly served using STATE DOLLARS while federal funds are used, as intended, in supplementary, targeted roles.

Meanwhile, as part of the state plan to improve services for the most at-risk students, increased attention with ND funds is being put into NEW transition services (not exceeding the eligible 30% of ND funds), NEW improved supplies, NEW tutorial services to those most at risk, a NEW category (neglected category), and NEW increased options and emphasis and programs to support academic, vocational and career preparation.

One of our new goals is to assist every exiting student to acquire and leave with a marketable skill so that students have at least one option to pursue besides "going back to business as usual" upon their exit. In short, if in the time we have students incarcerated, we do not give them new and better options to that which brought them incarceration, the likelihood of high recidivism or "advancement" to the adult penal system is glaringly obvious. Thus, targeted education, training and support, being a criminogenic factor, will hopefully reduce recidivism in a measurable way.

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	8
Juvenile Corrections	11

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Adult Corrections	2
Other	0
Total	21

Comments: The State of Utah, with its goals in Part D to cause maximum impact for THE MOST AT-RISK students, is in a two-stage evolution, making adjustments to its state plan beginning April 2012 and continuing through September 2014. The planning outcome will result in an eventual, purposeful, significant drop in eligible sites and enrollments with the potential of a gradual up-tick in eligible sites and enrollment numbers in following years.

Specific to this category, from last year to this year, the state criteria for eligible participation dropped from 26 sites to 21 sites (24% reduction). The impact, however, in numbers of eligible enrolled students, was a 57% drop, with 95% of the drop coming in formerly enrolled juvenile detention students. Nonetheless, juvenile detention students are being increasingly served using STATE DOLLARS while federal funds are used, as intended, in supplementary, targeted roles.

Meanwhile, as part of the state plan to improve services for the most at-risk students, increased attention with ND funds is being put into NEW transition services (not exceeding the eligible 30% of ND funds), NEW improved supplies, NEW tutorial services to those most at risk, a NEW category (neglected category), and NEW increased options and emphasis and programs to support academic, vocational and career preparation.

One of our new goals is to assist every exiting student to acquire and leave with a marketable skill so that students have at least one option to pursue besides "going back to business as usual" upon their exit. In short, if in the time we have students incarcerated, we do not give them new and better options to that which brought them incarceration, the likelihood of high recidivism or "advancement" to the adult penal system is glaringly obvious. Thus, targeted education, training and support, being a criminogenic factor, will hopefully reduce recidivism in a measurable way.

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	648	310	69	0
Long Term Students Served	0	49	218	69	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	39	7	2	0
Asian	0	5	2	0	0
Black or African American	0	29	20	7	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	156	98	36	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	9	11	3	0
White	0	397	169	21	0
Two or more races	0	13	3	0	0
Total	0	648	310	69	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	470	250	63	0
Female	0	178	60	6	0
Total	0	648	310	69	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	3	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	13	3	0	0
13	0	34	9	0	0
14	0	85	24	0	0
15	0	144	58	0	0
16	0	165	93	0	0
17	0	194	88	2	0
18	0	9	34	2	0
19	0	1	1	9	0
20	0	0	0	56	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	648	310	69	0

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The State of Utah, with its goals in Part D to cause maximum impact for THE MOST AT-RISK students, is in a two-stage evolution, making adjustments to its state plan beginning April 2012 and continuing through September 2014. The planning outcome will result in an eventual, purposeful, significant drop in eligible sites and enrollments with the potential of a gradual up-tick in eligible sites and enrollment numbers in following years.

Specific to this category, from last year to this year, the state criteria for eligible participation dropped from 26 sites to 21 sites (24% reduction). The impact, however, in numbers of eligible enrolled students, was a 57% drop, with 95% of the drop coming in formerly enrolled juvenile detention students. Nonetheless, juvenile detention students are being increasingly served using STATE DOLLARS while federal funds are used, as intended, in supplementary, targeted roles.

Meanwhile, as part of the state plan to improve services for the most at-risk students, increased attention with NO funds is being put into NEW transition services (not exceeding the eligible 30% of NO funds), NEW improved supplies, NEW tutorial services to those most at risk, a NEW category (neglected category), and NEW increased options and emphasis and programs to support academic, vocational and career preparation.

One of our new goals is to assist every exiting student to acquire and leave with a marketable skill so that students have at least one option to pursue besides "going back to business as usual" upon their exit. In short, if in the time we have students incarcerated, we do not give them new and better options to that which brought them incarceration, the likelihood of high recidivism or "advancement" to the adult penal system is glaringly obvious. Thus, targeted education, training and support, being a criminogenic factor, will hopefully reduce recidivism in a measurable way.

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	281	302	29	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	4	N<	N<	0
Comments: no comments					

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	485	135	27	0
Earned a GED	0	N<	N<	N<	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	4	14	4	0
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	0	N<	N<	N<	0

Comments: The State of Utah, with its goals in Part D to cause maximum impact for THE MOST AT-RISK students, is in a two-stage evolution, making adjustments to its state plan beginning April 2012 and continuing through September 2014. The planning outcome will result in an eventual, purposeful, significant drop in eligible sites and enrollments with the potential of a gradual up-tick in eligible sites and enrollment numbers in following years.

Specific to this category, from last year to this year, the state criteria for eligible participation dropped from 26 sites to 21 sites (24% reduction). The impact, however, in numbers of eligible enrolled students, was a 57% drop, with 95% of the drop coming in formerly enrolled juvenile detention students. Nonetheless, juvenile detention students are being increasingly served using STATE DOLLARS while federal funds are used, as intended, in supplementary, targeted roles.

Meanwhile, as part of the state plan to improve services for the most at-risk students, increased attention with ND funds is being put into NEW transition services (not exceeding the eligible 30% of ND funds), NEW improved supplies, NEW tutorial services to those most at risk, a NEW category (neglected category), and NEW increased options and emphasis and programs to support academic, vocational and career preparation.

One of our new goals is to assist every exiting student to acquire and leave with a marketable skill so that students have at least one option to pursue besides "going back to business as usual" upon their exit. In short, if in the time we have students incarcerated, we do not give them new and better options to that which brought them incarceration, the likelihood of high recidivism or "advancement" to the adult penal system is glaringly obvious. Thus, targeted education, training and support, being a criminogenic factor, will hopefully reduce recidivism in a measurable way.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training course/programs	0	25	54	N<	0
Obtained employment	0	N<	N<	N<	0
Comments: This is one of the areas we hope to see good gains in 2012-2013 school year and even more gains in 2013-2014 school year since the state is putting added emphasis in this and other areas such as student transition support.					

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year.Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	5	25	4	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	27	144	22	0

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	5	N<	N<	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	14	39	8	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	N<	N<	N<	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	N<	35	N<	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	4	44	10	0
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term students:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	N<	12	6	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	31	148	23	0

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	N<	12	6	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	19	36	7	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	N<	10	N<	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	N<	50	N<	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	4	40	5	0
Comments:					

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students.

Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

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

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

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

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American					
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White					
Two or more races					
Total					

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

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

21					
Total					

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

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

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

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

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

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

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (TITLE IV,PART A).

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease or hold steady the number of "persistently dangerous schools" as defined by Board Rule R277-483. "Persistently Dangerous Schools."	Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Effectiveness Report	Annually	2011-12	2009-10: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2009-10: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2003
				2010-11: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2010-11: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0		
				2011-12: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2011-12: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0		
				2012-13: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0			
				2013-14: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0			
Comments: Even though SDFS State Grant Funding was eliminated, the Utah State Office of Education continues to work wit districts to ensure that keeping schools safe and conducive to learning is a top priority.							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2009-10: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2009-10: The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2010-11: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2010-11: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.7%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 31.3%		
				2011-12: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2012-13: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 33.1%			
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Favorable Attitudes to Antisocial Behaviors"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2011	2013-14: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 33.1%		6th Grade 30.5% 8th Grade 25.4% 10th Grade 35.3% 12th Grade 36.1%	2003
Comments: With the results of the 2011 SHARP Data we were pleased that this risk factor was decreasing as was the goal o our prevention efforts. We are looking forward to the 2013 SHARP Survey this Spring to see continual success.							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Intentions to use ATODs"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2011	2009-10: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2009-10: The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.	6th Grade 23.0% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 16.4% 12th Grade 12.0%	2003
				2010-11: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2010-11: 6th Grade 19.7%, 8th Grade 16.2%, 10th Grade 21.6%, 12th Grade 24.4%		
				2011-12: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2012-13: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%			
				2013-14: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%			

Comments: With the exception of 6th Grade, there were some increases in this risk factor which comes to our attention and will therefore be focused on in our prevention efforts. We will be doing the SHARP Survey again this spring 2013 and will look forward to success we have had in this area.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2009-10: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	2009-10: The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.		

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Perceived risk of Drug Use"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2011	2010-11: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6% 2011-12: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6% 2012-13: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6% 2013-14: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	2010-11: 6th Grade 33.1%, 8th Grade 24.2%, 10th Grade 30.4%, 12th Grade 27.5% 2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.	6th Grade 19.5% 8th Grade 20.2% 10th Grade 16.8% 12th Grade 23.6%	2003
Comments: We will be doing the SHARP Survey again this spring 2013 and will look forward to success we have had in this area.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2009-10: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%	2009-10: The data is the same as 2008-09. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2010-11: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%	2010-11: 6th Grad Alcohol 1.4%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.5%, Inhalants 1.7%, 8th Grade Alcohol 6.0%, Tobacco 3.6%, Marijuana 3.6%, Inhalants 3.2%, 10th Grade Alcohol 11.2%, Tobacco 6.7%, Marijuana 7.9%, Inhalants 1.4%, 12th Grade Alcohol 17.0%, Tobacco 11.8%, Marijuana 9.8%,Inhalants 0.8%		
				2011-12: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%,	2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.		

Decrease the percentage of students reporting "30 day use of ATODs"	Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison	Biennially	2011	10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0% 2012-13: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0% 2013-14: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.5%, Tobacco 1.0%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 2.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 7.6%, Tobacco 3.0%, Marijuana 2.5%, Inhalants 3.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%		6th Grade Alcohol 1.9%, Tobacco 1.4%, Marijuana 0.3%, Inhalants 3.4%, 8th Grade Alcohol 8.6%, Tobacco 3.7%, Marijuana 2.9%, Inhalants 5.0%, 10th Grade Alcohol 15.9%, Tobacco 6.9%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.3%, 12th Grade Alcohol 21.1%, Tobacco 11.4%, Marijuana 10.0%, Inhalants 2.4%	2003

Comments: We are pleased with the continual results of our prevention efforts in decreasing 30 day Alcohol use. Due to the extra effort put on Underage Drinking we see that the Alcohol 30 Day use has gone done in each area based on the 2011 SHARP Survey.
We see some slight increases in marijuana use. We are looking at focusing some efforts in that arena. We will be doing the SHARP Survey again this spring 2013 and will look forward to success we have had in this area.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1,347	122
6 through 8	1,294	122
9 through 12	649	122
Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing last year's data some grades are higher and some lower. Where LEAs are recording incidents into their SIS System as they occur this data we believe is becoming more reliable. We do spend time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	122
6 through 8	6	122
9 through 12	10	122
Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. We do spen time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS. Doing so we are becoming more consistent with reliable data.		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	51	122
6 through 8	26	122
9 through 12	17	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing last year's data some grades are higher and some lower. Where LEAs are recording incidents into their SIS System as they occur this data we believe is becoming more reliable. We do spend time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	122
6 through 8	0	122
9 through 12	N<	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. We do spen time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS. Doing so we are becoming more consistent with reliable data.

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	226	122
6 through 8	205	122
9 through 12	119	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing last year's data some grades are higher and some lower. Where LEAs are recording incidents into their SIS System as they occur this data we believe is becoming more reliable. We do spend time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	122
6 through 8	N<	122
9 through 12	8	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. We do spend time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS. Doing so we are becoming more consistent with reliable data.

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	4	122
6 through 8	62	122
9 through 12	118	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing last year's data some grades are higher and some lower. Where LEAs are recording incidents into their SIS System as they occur this data we believe is becoming more reliable. We do spend time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	122
6 through 8	N<	122
9 through 12	0	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. We do spen time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS. Doing so we are becoming more consistent with reliable data.

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	46	122
6 through 8	535	122
9 through 12	692	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing last year's data some grades are higher and some lower. Where LEAs are recording incidents into their SIS System as they occur this data we believe is becoming more reliable. We do spend time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	122
6 through 8	5	122
9 through 12	13	122

Comments: This is the second year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. We do spen time in data meetings discussing with districts the importance of the data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS. Doing so we are becoming more consistent with reliable data.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

With the revision of our research-based Prevention Dimensions K-12 prevention program many lessons have parent connections. Teachers are encouraged to send home assignments and information with students. This allows the parents to become more involved in the information and prevention that is taking place at the schools. Parents are able to reinforce these prevention ideas in the home.

Our office also partners with Parents Empowered. This is Utah's Underage Prevention Media Campaign. The focus is to provide parents with important information to keep their kids alcohol free. It not only focuses on the harm to a childs developing brain but also provides parents with the important skills of bonding, setting clear rules and monitoring. We are in the 6th year of this very successful Underage Drinking campaign which is lowering the alcohol use among teens in our state.

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	
Parental involvement activities	
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	
Comments: For the 2011-2012 school year, Utah had no LEAs that qualified for RLIS funds.	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

IFor the 2011-2012 school year, Utah had no LEAs that qualified for RLIS funds.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2011-12?	_____No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	0
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	**# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program**	**# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program**
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)		
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	//////////////////////////////	
In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2012 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.		

Program	**Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program**	**Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program**
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)		
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	//////////////////////////////	
Total		
Comments: No LEAs used the Tranferability of Funds option during the 2011-2012 school year.		

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2011-12). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.66
Asian	79.40
Black or African American	64.18
Hispanic or Latino	66.11
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75.56
White	83.43
Two or more races	81.15
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	63.98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	50.75
Economically disadvantaged	69.63

FAQs on graduation rates:

- What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf.

  The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The data has been corrected from the initial submission. The multiple race field was not included as the change from 5 to 7 ethnicity/race values took place during this cohort. To be consistent, the multiple was not calculated.

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States granted ESEA Flexibility should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to EDFacts.

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to reward (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the school was identified as a high progress or high performing reward school
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(g).

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific designation (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessmentWhether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement v Year 1, School Improvement v Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific status for SY 2012-13 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.