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 2012-13

UTAH

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

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) 2012-13 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 conduciv to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high schoo

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 implementati 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 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2012-13 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 2012-13 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, 2012-13 _X_Part II, 2012-13

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

_____ Friday, April 4, 2014, 2:07:38 PM
Signature

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II

For reporting on

School Year 2012-13

PART II DUE FEBRUARY 17, 2012
5PM EST

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	13,036	S	70.7
4	12,892	S	72.4
5	12,297	S	73.6
6	8,818	S	68.3
7	2,869	S	72
8	2,494	S	54
High School	1,119	S	45
Total	53,525	S	70.1
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	13,008	S	74.4
4	12,877	S	71.2
5	12,270	S	73.4
6	8,796	S	74.3
7	2,892	S	72
8	2,901	S	79
High School	1,234	S	79
Total	53,978	S	73.6
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,857	S	76.8
4	4,696	S	79.1
5	4,251	S	80.4
6	3,596	S	75.4
7	3,438	S	83.8
8	2,887	S	72
High School	1,232	S	61
Total	24,957	S	77.2
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,851	S	80.4
4	4,685	S	79.5
5	4,248	S	81.8
6	3,589	S	84.1
7	3,460	S	83.7
8	3,182	S	91.3
High School	1,318	S	91
Total	25,333	S	83.4
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*)	20,433
Limited English proficient students	22,273
Students who are homeless	7,835
Migratory students	523
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	4,670
Asian	2,457
Black or African American	2,997
Hispanic or Latino	42,686
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,927
White	80,386
Two or more races	2,217
Total	138,340
Comments: There is a small discrepancy in the total number of students served by Racial/Ethnic Group (2.1.2.2) when compared to the total number of students served by grade level (2.1.2.3). We are working to identify the error and make corrections.	

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
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	0	5,554		0	5,554
K	1,178	17,695	13	0	18,886
1	1,559	16,982	17	0	18,558
2	1,440	16,061	22	0	17,523
3	1,239	15,550	25	0	16,814
4	1,219	15,370	26	0	16,615
5	1,092	14,570	24	0	15,686
6	663	10,647	20	0	11,330
7	569	3,641	7	0	4,217
8	483	3,721	7	0	4,211
9	420	3,159		0	3,579
10	191	1,650		0	1,841
11	190	1,673		0	1,863
12	111	1,605		0	1,716
Ungraded	0	0		0	0
TOTALS	10,354	127,878	161	0	138,393

Comments: There is a small discrepancy in the total number of students served by Racial/Ethnic Group (2.1.2.2) when compared to the total number of students served by grade level (2.1.2.3). We are working to identify the error and make corrections.

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	4,957
Reading/language arts	7,212
Science	657
Social studies	161
Vocational/career	54
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 Suport Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	20
Supporting guidance/advocacy	192
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	74	
Paraprofessionals[1]	141	93.80
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	2	
Clerical support staff	7	
Administrators (non-clerical)	10	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

a. 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:
(a) 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;
(b) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
(c) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
(d) Conducting parental involvement activities;
(e) Providing support in a library or media center;
(f) Acting as a translator; or
(g) Providing instructional services to students.

b. What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.

c. 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]	563.00	95.30
Comments:		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2012 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012−2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012−2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs*	82	24
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	73,872	1,628,279
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	8,662,315	81,072,184
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.90	2.00

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2012 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 2012−2013.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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 performance period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count.*

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

FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2011 v August 31, 2012), youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: None.

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is

calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	141
K	91
1	89
2	96
3	88
4	80
5	65
6	93
7	63
8	71
9	53
10	56
11	46
12	38
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	17
Total	1,087
Comments: The data are correct. Assessment disparities were addressed.	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The migrant population is not static, therefore it is expected that there will be increases or decreases from one year to the next. They might not be the same students counted for those grades as last year.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children from age birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	
Comments: There were no students reported in this age group for this reporting period.	

2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	41
1	38
2	38
3	80
4	29
5	30
6	31
7	21
8	17
9	14
10	21
11	12
12	8
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	381
Comments: The data are correct. The submitted file did not correctly populate the online tool during the initial reporting period. After resubmission of the same file, the correct data are now populating this table.	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received .Q!!!y referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	a
Comments: There were no students reported in this category for this reporting period	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	_____No
MIS 2000	_____No
COEStar	_____No
MAPS	_____Yes
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	_____No

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	Yes

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Data Collection and Management Procedures	(Yes/No)
Does the State collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	Ye

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period . In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- Children who were age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods
- Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category
- Children two years of age that turned three years old during the performance period.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MEP recruiters conduct face to face interviews to complete all data required in the National COE. The COE is signed by the parent/guardian and the recruiter verifying the accuracy of the information therein. The LOA MEP Director reviews each COE and signs if complete. The COE information is entered into the State MEP data system (MAPS) where it is submitted for SEA review of each COE. If the COE is correct, then it is approved and entered into the system for upload into the State Data Base. If at any level of COE review, there is an error or inconsistency, the COE is returned to the recruiter for re-interview. The MAPS system only allows students that have eligible Qualifying Arrival Dates during the performance period to be entered into the migrant student counts. If a student is entered into MAPS that has expired or ineligible criteria, MAPS automatically places the student's COE into a "withdrawn" file in the system. The MAPS system automatically flags any student that has turned 3 years old during the performance period. LOAs are responsible to report and enter data for any migrant student that was a resident in Utah for at least 1 day and were served for 1 or more days during the summer program or intersession periods. This information is reviewed and corroborated with each LOA at the SEA COE review.

Each eligible student is given a unique state student MEP number as well as a State Student Identification number. The MAPS MEP data system is uploaded into the Utah State Data Warehouse where each record is matched by SSID number with any student information that has been reported by the LOA on those students through their LOA to the State Data Warehouse. These records are reviewed multiple times by the SEA to account for and rectify any inconsistencies and/or duplications.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED*Facts* data file?

Each migrant student data file is matched from the MAPS system to any and all existing student files in the State Data Warehouse: SSID numbers are matched in both systems. Each student file is reviewed multiple times to account for inconsistencies, errors or duplications and corrected immediately with cooperation with the LOA that reported the student data. Utah also uses MSIX to compare student counts with what was reported in MAPS and through EDFACTS.

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	**(Yes/No)**
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	Yes

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah uses MSIX to compare student counts with what was reported in MAPS and through EDFACTS.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	Yes
Do the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	Yes
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	Yes
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	Yes
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	Yes
Does the SEA review student attendance at summer/inter-session projects?	Yes
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	Yes
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	Yes
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	Yes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	420
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	249
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	248

Describe any reasons children were determined ineligible in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The one student was eligible until 1/01/2011 (36 months) from l/01/2008 to 1/01/2011. The LOA could service that student until the end of the 2011 school year. The student was not eligible for the start of 2011-12 school year in that particular LOA.

Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

students were organized into districts to facilitate the re-interviewing process. The audit interviewer visited each district and contacted as many available families as possible. The interviewer contacted each family three times (when possible) before crossing a student off the sample list as unavailable. However, it is important to note that time constraints affected the re-interviewers ability to re-contact some families. In addition, some families refused to provide information to the re-interviewer.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	
Both	Face-to-face re-interviews

Obtaining Data From Families	**Yes/No**
Was there a standard instrument used?	Yes
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers trained and provided instruments?	Yes
Did the recruitment personnel who made the initial eligibility determinations also conduct the re-interviews with the same families?	No
When were the most recent independent re-interviews completed (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LOA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	(MM/YY) 10/12

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this performance period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The re-interviews were conducted by an outside contractor (Educational Research and Training Corporation)out of Greeley, Colorado who hired and trained their own re-interviewers independent of the Utah MEP.

Utah MEP recruiters re-interview for every reported elibile migrant student every program year to determine continued eligibility for the program and for changes in student data.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following actions were taken by the SEA with regards to the one student found ineligible during the re-interview process:
1. The immediate removal of the one ineligible student identified in the audit still listed as an active migrant student,
2. The continuation of a regular audit process (e.g. annually) of current Utah Migrant Programs to identify issues and correct problems quickly;
3. Requirement of all districts receiving migrant funds to attend a rigorous recruiter training program.

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 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.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
K	4
1	14
2	25
3	14
4	10
5	6
6	25
7	1
8	5
9	3
10	12
11	4
12	4
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	4
Total	143

Comments: PFS was incorrectly calculated by MAPS contractor. Data has been recalculated and resubmitted. It appears that there is still a small error within the data.

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.

2.3.2.2 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) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46
K	61
1	65
2	66
3	43
4	40
5	30
6	39
7	33
8	30
9	22
10	19
11	17
12	15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	8
Total	534
Comments: No students were reported for "Ungraded" during the performance period.	

2.3.2.3 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) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	12
1	6
2	5
3	12
4	10
5	10
6	15
7	16
8	8
9	7
10	7
11	7
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	3
Total	135

Comments: We have reviewed this year's data for accuracy and found it to be correct. We also reviewed prior years' data for three years and found that this count is within normal reporting parameters. In 2009-10, we reported 166 IDEA students. In 2010-11, we reported 179 students. In 2012-13, we reported 75 students.

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2013 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	19
1	11
2	16
3	15
4	12
5	7
6	20
7	4
8	6
9	5
10	10
11	3
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2
Total	167
Comments: No students were reported for "Age birth through 2", or "Ungraded" during the performance period.	

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose most recent qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2012-13 regular school year) The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	114
K	88
1	88
2	95
3	85
4	79
5	63
6	93
7	63
8	70
9	53
10	56
11	46
12	37
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	16
Total	1,046
Comments: There were no students reported for "Age birth through 2", or "Ungraded" for this performance period.	

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a 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 received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	3
1	2
2	5
3	9
4	4
5	3
6	4
7	5
8	4
9	3
10	3
11	0
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	50
Comments: The data are accurate as reported.	

2.3.2.7 Referrals — During the Summer/ Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** 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 received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	1
1	0
2	1
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	1
7	0
8	0
9	1
10	1
11	0
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	6
Comments:	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	4
9	0
10	0
11	S
12	4
Ungraded	0
Total	10
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "drop outs of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the performance 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 2011-12 performance period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 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 GED	#
Obtained a GED in your State During the Performance Period	0
Comments:	

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data- Regular School Year

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant children in MEP-funded services during the regular school year.

Participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Eligible migrant children and children who continued to receive MEP-funded 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 Schoolwide Program (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were only served 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.

2.3.3.1 MEP Children 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 the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	114
K	88
1	88
2	95
3	85
4	79
5	63
6	93
7	63
8	70
9	53
10	56
11	46
12	37
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	16
Total	1,046
Comments:	

2.3.3.2 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 MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5	25
K	17
1	10
2	15
3	9
4	8
5	4
6	16
7	1
8	3
9	2
10	8
11	2
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2
Total	125

Comments: PFS was incorrectly calculated by MAPS contractor. Data has been recalculated and resubmitted. It appears that there is still a small disparity between files 121 and 123.

2.3.3.3 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 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 During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	10
K	18
1	13
2	14
3	13
4	7
5	9
6	11
7	7
8	15
9	9
10	6
11	6
12	9
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	147
Comments: The data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.3.4 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	Instructional Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten	0
K	60
1	57
2	60
3	78
4	47
5	46
6	54
7	43
8	46
9	36
10	40
11	29
12	23
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	630
Comments: The data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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 During the Regular School Year	Mathematics Instruction During the Regular School Year	High School Credit Accrual During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0	
K	60	59	
1	57	57	
2	60	60	
3	78	76	
4	47	47	
5	46	45	
6	54	54	
7	43	43	
8	46	46	
9	36	36	13
10	40	40	10
11	29	29	6
12	23	23	2
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	11	0	1
Total	630	615	32
Comments: The data are accurate as reported.			

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.

2.3.3.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Regular School Year

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	Support Services During the Regular School Year	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	9	0
1	18	0
2	16	0
3	43	0
4	12	0
5	17	0
6	14	0
7	11	0
8	19	0
9	12	1
10	16	1
11	12	0
12	5	2
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	5	0
Total	209	4

Comments: The data are correct as reported. Historical data indicates that last year's services were reported to be much higher than the previous two years. Counts for those years are in line with this year's data.

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.

2.3.4 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.

2.3.4.1 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 the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	45
K	41
1	38
2	38
3	35
4	29
5	30
6	31
7	21
8	17
9	14
10	21
11	12
12	8
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	381
Comments: The data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.4.2 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 MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5	11
K	10
1	4
2	10
3	5
4	2
5	2
6	8
7	0
8	2
9	1
10	4
11	2
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	62
Comments:	No students for "Age 3 through 5", "Ungraded", or "Out-of-School" were reported during this performance period.

2.3.4.4 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	Instructional Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten	0
K	34
1	36
2	36
3	75
4	28
5	30
6	29
7	21
8	17
9	13
10	20
11	11
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	357
Comments: The data are correct as reported.	

2.3.4.4.1 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 During the Summer/ Intersession Term	Mathematics Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term	High School Credit Accrual During the Summer/ Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0	
K	33	33	
1	36	35	
2	36	35	
3	75	74	
4	28	27	
5	28	27	
6	29	28	
7	21	21	
8	17	17	
9	13	13	9
10	20	20	13
11	11	11	9
12	7	7	6
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	354	348	37
Comments:			

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.

2.3.4.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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	Support Services During the Summer/Intersession Term	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	2	0
1	3	0
2	4	0
3	7	0
4	3	0
5	3	0
6	4	0
7	1	0
8	3	0
9	3	0
10	4	0
11	2	0
12	1	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	1	0
Total	41	0
Comments: The data are correct as reported.		

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.

2.3.5 MEP Participation – Performance Period

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 performance period. 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 Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	141
K	91
1	89
2	96
3	88
4	80
5	65
6	93
7	63
8	71
9	53
10	56
11	46
12	38
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	17
Total	1,087
Comments:	

2.3.6 School Data During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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 regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	129
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	1,087
Comments:	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in School Wide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

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 regular school 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 are no Title I schools in Utah that consolidate MEP funds as part of Title I Schoolwide program; the answer to the questions above is "0".	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 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 from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State 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.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	14	231
Regular school year - school day/extended day	1	18
Summer/intersession only	14	406
Year round	43	443
Comments:		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.

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.

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 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 performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

State Director FTE	0.60
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

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

2.3.8.2 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.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	7	5	114	93
Counselors	1	1	1	
All paraprofessionals	60	31	148	120
Recruiters	17	12	14	7
Records transfer staff	4	2	3	2
Administrators	8	3	4	4
Comments:				

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.

2.3.8.3 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.

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	11	4.70	35	19.30
Comments:				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

2.4 Prevention and Intervention Programs For Children And Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, Or At Risk (Title I, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013.
- 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	1	305
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	14	314
Adult corrections	2	365
Other		
Total	17	

Comments: The number of eligible LEA programs dropped from 2012 as anticipated.

As part of the state strategic plan, detention sites did not receive federal ND dollars. Their educational needs were covered by state funds instead.

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 Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 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	1
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	14
Adult Corrections	2
Other	
Total	17

Comments: All eligible LEAs reported data.

Please see comments in this section from last year's report.

The partial fulfillment of the strategic plan mentioned in last year's report shows up in this year's report.

As part of the state strategic plan, detention sites did not receive federal ND dollars. Their educational needs were covered by state funds instead.

Additionally, the increased attention to targeted focus on and strengthening of transition (within the legal limits of 30% of allocable funds) has resulted in improvements in certain measurable outcomes as reported in sections of this report.

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 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA) and limited English proficiency (LEP), 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	51	0	609	89	0
Total Long Term Students Served	51		609	89	0

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	34	0	69	0	0
LEP Students	0	0	47	6	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0	31	4	0
Asian	0	0	2	1	0
Black or African American	4	0	34	4	0
Hispanic or Latino	1	0	182	32	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	17	5	0
White	45	0	341	43	0
Two or more races	0	0	2	0	0
Total	51	0	609	89	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	29	0	488	83	0
Female	22	0	121	6	0
Total	51	0	609	89	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	4	0	0	0	0
9	2	0	0	0	0
10	4	0	0	0	0
11	3	0	0	0	0
12	7	0	4	0	0
13	6	0	22	0	0
14	7	0	51	0	0
15	6	0	101	0	0
16	8	0	157	0	0
17	3	0	190	1	0
18	1	0	78	7	0
19	0	0	6	14	0
20	0	0	0	66	0
21	0	0	0	1	0
Total	51	0	609	89	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: Juvenile detention students were served using state dollars only. This year, we also began serving an eligible Neglected program.

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	N		Y	Y	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	51		609	89	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: We have put a lot more time and training into transition services.

Some districts within EACH sector are able to collect data from some LEA and JJS sources, but there is not 100% collection capacity in each sector even though we record YES for both Juvenile and Adult Corrections.

2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in their local district school	14	0			292	112	60	S	0	0
Earned high school course credits	23	0			600	73	29	S	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	S	0			17	4	S	S	0	0
Earned a GED	S	0			9	S	S	S	0	0
Obtained high school diploma	S	0			41	7	6	S	0	0
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	0			S	19	S	S	0	0
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	0			S	14	S	S	0	0
Obtained employment	S	0			14	47	S	6	0	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: We have put a lot of attention to advancing both the "academic" and CTE ("vocational") acquisition of credit. Additionally, the increased training in and support for "transition" (all within the 30% legal limits) has also given positive outcomes in several key indicators.

With the goal to assist students to exit incarceration with "more POSITIVE marketable skills" than which they entered, significant energy was placed in both their acquiring "academic" skill sets and CTE (vocational) credits. Additionally, 73 students earned "certificates" such as food handlers permits and flagging certifications. With the assistance of Juvenile Justice and our own Education Training and Career Advocates (ETCAs), we are hoping to see ongoing increases in positive

employment engagement of recently-released incarcerated youth and hopeful spin offs of their acquiring further positive educational credentials.

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 four 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, 2012, 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	32		150	52	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	51		155	25	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	8		30	S	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	32		34	14	0
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	6		68	5	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	5		23	5	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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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	27		162	64	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	51		155	36	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	11		27	4	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	28		32	19	0
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S		73	7	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	9		23	6	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: Utah does not participate in Subpart 2.		

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 disability (IDEA), and limited English proficiency (LEP), 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					

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)					
LEP Students					

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.

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?					
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.					

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in their local district school										
Earned high school course credits										
Enrolled in a GED program										
Earned a GED										
Obtained high school diploma										
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education										
Enrolled in job training courses/programs										
Obtained employment										

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 four change categories in the second table below. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the tables below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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 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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

Is reporting pre-posttest data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre-posttest data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

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 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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.7 Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease or hold steady the number of "persistently dangerous schools" as defined by Board Rule R277-483. "Persistently Dangerous Schools."	Annual Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Effectiveness Report	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: 2010-11: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2011-12: 2011-12: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2012-13: 2012-13: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2013-14: 2013-14: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2014-15: 2014-15: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2010-11: 2010-11: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2011-12: 2011-12: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0 2012-13: 2012-13: High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	High Schools 0 Jr./Middle Schools 0 Elementary 0	2003
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	**Instrument/**	**Frequency of**	**Year of most recent**		**Actual**		**Year Baseline**

Indicator	Data Source	Collection	collection	Targets	Performance	Baseline	Established
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Favorable Attitudes to Antisocial Behaviors"	SHARP Survey "Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison"	Biennially	2013	2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 28.5%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 34.3%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.7%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 31.3%	6th Grade 30.5% 8th Grade 25.4% 10th Grade 35.3% 12th Grade 36.1%	2003
				2011-12: 2011-12: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2011-12: 2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2012-13: 2012-13: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 33.1%	2012-13: 2012-13: 6th Grade 27.7%, 8th Grade 25.9%, 10th Grade 31.0%, 12th Grade 32.3%		
				2013-14: 2013-14: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 31.1%, 12th Grade 33.1%			
				2014-15: 2014-15: 6th Grade 24.1%, 8th Grade 24.4%, 10th Grade 30.0%, 12th Grade 33.1%			

Comments: Comments: With the results of the 2013 SHARP Data we were pleased that 10th grade had a slight decrease in this factor. However, we noticed a slight increase in the other grades which we need to assess perhaps why that is the case. From the baseline established in 2003 we are down and are pleased with the prevention work that continues in our schools.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade	2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 19.7%, 8th Grade 16.2%, 10th		

				16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	Grade 21.6%, 12th Grade 24.4%		
				2011-12: 2011-12: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2011-12: 2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.		
				2012-13: 2012-13: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%	2012-13: 2012-13 Unfortunately this data is the same as noted last year.		
				2013-14: 2013-14: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%			
				2014-15: 2014-15: 6th Grade 18.3%, 8th Grade 11.4%, 10th Grade 16.7%, 12th Grade 17.2%			
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Intentions to use ATODs"	SHARP Survey "Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison"	Biennially	2013			6th Grade 23.0% 8th Grade 13.8% 10th Grade 16.4% 12th Grade 12.0%	2003

Comments: Comments: The questions which measure this indicator were unfortunately left off the survey during the 2013 administration. They will be back on the survey in the 2015 administration.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	2010-11: 2010-11: 6th Grade 33.1%, 8th Grade 24.2%, 10th Grade 30.4%, 12th Grade 27.5%		
				2011-12: 2011-12: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade	2011-12: 2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey		

				27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	will be completed this spring.		
				2012-13: 2012-13: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8th Grade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%	2012-13: 2012-13: 6th Grade 31.0%, 8th Grade 24.6%, 10th Grade 31.2%, 12th Grade 28.9%		
				2013-14: 2013-14: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8thGrade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%			
Decrease in percentage of students at risk on the scale "Perceived risk of Drug Use"	SHARP Survey "Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison"	Biennially	2013	2014-15: 2014-15: 6th Grade 29.1%, 8thGrade 20.6%, 10th Grade 27.1%, 12th Grade 20.6%		6th Grade 19.5% 8th Grade 20.2% 10th Grade 16.8% 12th Grade 23.6%	2003

Comments: Comments: With this indicator we have seen some small increased in preceived drug use. We are watching this carefully, due to the national perception of what is happening with marijuana and especially in states close to us, the legalization of it. That tends to contribute to a perception that it may not be as harmful as they say it is.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 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: 2010-11: 6th Grade 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: 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%,10th Grade Alcohol 13.9%, Tobacco 6.0%, Marijuana 6.8%, Inhalants 3.0%, 12th Grade Alcohol 18.1%, Tobacco 10.0%, Marijuana 8.0%, Inhalants 1.0%	2011-12: 2011-12: The data is the same as 2010-11. Another survey will be completed this spring.			
				2012-13: 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%	2012-13: 2012-13: 6th Grade Alcohol 1.0%, Tobacco 0.8%, Marijuana 0.6%, Inhalants 2.0%, 8th Grade Alcohol 4.2%, Tobacco 2.4%, Marijuana 4.2%, Inhalants 2.1%, 10th Grade Alcohol 9.4%, Tobacco 5.0%, Marijuana 9.1%, Inhalants 1.2%, 12th Grade Alcohol 14.0%, Tobacco 6.8%, Marijuana 9.9%,Inhalants 0.5%			
				2013-14: 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		
				2014-15: 2014				

Decrease the percentage of students reporting "30 day use of ATODs"	SHARP Survey "Prevention Needs Assessment Bach-Harrison"	Biennially	2013	15: 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%		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: 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 2013 SHARP Survey.
We continue to see some slight increases in marijuana use. We are sure that this is partly do to the national attention given this and the legalization in some close by states. This drives up the attitude that it appears not to be that bad, which in turn drives up the intended and use rates.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Alcohol -- Any product containing at least .0063% alcohol by volume or .005% alcohol by weight. Examples include beer, wine, and spirits (vodka, gins, whiskey, rum, cordials, etc.).
Illicit drug related	Controlled Substance - A drug or other substance regulated by the Controlled Substances Act [Title 58, chapter 37, UCA]. Examples include methamphetamine, LSD, designer drugs, phencyclidine (PCP), heroin, etc. Also included in this category is the unauthorized possession or use of a prescription drug such as amphetamines, barbiturates, Valium, codeine, and Ritalin. Uncontrolled Substance (Over-the-Counter, Inhalants, Lookalikes)- A substance which can be legally purchased without prescription, if its manner of use or apparent intended use is for a purpose other than that intended by the manufacturer. Examples include over-the-counter (non-prescription) and mail order (look-alike) drugs such as cold medicines, cough syrup, diet pills, sleeping pills, NoDoz, and nicotine patches. Also included in this category are common substances abused as inhalants including hair spray, gasoline, butane, rubber cement, glue, furniture polish, air fresheners, spray paint, liquid correction fluid, inhalers, breath spray, felt tip markers, propane gas, cleaning fluids, tape head cleaners, aerosol whipped cream propellants, vegetable sprays, paintthinners, degreasers, and art or office supply solvents. Drug Paraphernalia -- Any item used or intended for use in the creation, distribution, or use of a controlled substance [Title 58, Chapter 37a, UCA], e.g. syringes, bongs, roach clips, pipes, water pipes, clips, spoons, needles, etc. Other Drug - Alcohol / Drug offenses that do not fit in any of the current categories. For example, the possession of any substance that substantially resembles or is meant to represent any illegal drug or unauthorized substance. Unknown Drug-- A person who appears to be under the influence of a psychoactive substance but the substance is unknown.
Violent incident without physical injury	Violent incident--An incident in the assault violations, weapons violations, and other incidents including: bullying, kidnapping, actual or attempted robbery, sexual offenses and threat or intimidation which is committed without a physical injury.
Violent incident with physical injury	Violent incident--An incident in the assault violations, weapons violations, and other incidents including:bullying, kidnapping, actual or attempted robbery, sexual offenses and threat or intimidation which is committed resulting in a physical injury. Physical injury is defined as damage to bodily tissue that includes: skin bruising, dislocation, impairment of physical function, bleeding, burn, bone fracture, soft tissue swelling,injury to an internal organ or any physical condition that imperils the health/welfare of a student.
Weapons possession	Type of Weapon - Select either Real or Look-Alike. If both a real and look-alike weapon are possessed (i.e., real handgun and look alike handgun), select "Real". Real - A weapon capable of performing the action implied by its category (i.e., A "handgun" capable of firing a projectile with deadly force or a "Knife or Sharpened Edge" capable of cutting.). Look-Alike - object, device or instrument having or made to have the appearance of a weapon. Examples include weapons that are broken or non-functional, toy guns and knives, devices made to look like bombs, and any object that is a non-functioning facsimile of a real weapon. Type of Violation - Select one of the following (ordered from most to least severe): Used, Threatened Use, or Possession. If two apply, select the more severe violation to report. Used - The weapon was employed (i.e., a handgun was fired, a stabbing or attempted stabbing took place, an explosive device was detonated, etc.). Threatened - The weapon (or look alike) was brandished or its presence made known and an intention to use was indicated. Possession -- Having real or look alike weapons on their person, in their locker, under their control, or in their custody. Categories of Weapons - There are five categories of weapons in the system: Handgun; Rifle/Shotgun; BB/Pellet Gun; Knife/Sharpened Edge; and Other Weapon, Firearm or Explosive Device. Handgun -- A firearm having a short stock designed to be held and fired by the use of a single hand and easily concealed upon the person. Examples include pistols, derringers, and revolvers. Rifle -- A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder and to use the energy of the explosive in a fixed metallic cartridge to fire a projectile through a rifled bore. Shotgun -- A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder and to use the energy of the explosive in a shotgun shell to fire either a number of ball shot or a single slug through a smooth bore. BB or Pellet Gun -- Weapons where a small BB, pellet, or other projectile (usually 18 caliber or less) is fired through the use of a

powerful spring or compressed gas mechanism. Knife / Sharpened Edge -- Any object with a sharpened edge such as a knife, bayonet, razor blade, machete, sword, etc. Objects with sharpened points such as scissors,
darts, spikes, nails, and pencils are "other" weapons. Other Weapon, Firearm or Explosive Device - All otherweapons. 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	1,418	132
6 through 8	1,118	132
9 through 12	633	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing las 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 and consistent from year to year. We continue to spend time in data and program 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	S	132
6 through 8	4	132
9 through 12	7	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing las 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 and consistent from year to year. We continue to spend time in data and program 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 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	19	132
6 through 8	12	132
9 through 12	10	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing la s year's data we have lower numbers in each of the grade levels. We are pleased with these results. 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 and program 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	132
6 through 8	0	132
9 through 12	0	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. As you can see we did have any expulsions. We are pleased with these results. 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 and program 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 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	283	132
6 through 8	205	132
9 through 12	147	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing la s year's data elementary and high school are a little higher. 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 and program 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	S	132
6 through 8	S	132
9 through 12	S	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. Similar to last year. 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 and program 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 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	S	132
6 through 8	75	132
9 through 12	133	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. In comparing las year's data we had some increases in the middle/jr and high school. 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. It appears that the data is becoming more consistent where we can use it as more reliable in how progress is or is not being made towards reductions.

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	132
6 through 8	0	132
9 through 12	0	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. We are pleased with no explusions for this category this year. 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. It appears that the data is becoming more consistent where we can use it as more reliable in how progress is or is not being made towards reductions.

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	34	132
6 through 8	460	132
9 through 12	653	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. It appears we ar becoming more consistent from year to year. In comparing last year's data each grade level has a decrease which is positive. 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 and program meetings discussing with districts the importance of this 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	0	132
6 through 8	4	132
9 through 12	10	132

Comments: This is the third year the data has come directly into USOE from the LEAs by grade level as well. It appears we ar becoming more consistent from year to year. In comparing last year's data each grade level has a decrease, with 0 in the elementary grades, which is positive. 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 and program meetings discussing with districts the importance of this data and help them understand what needs to be reported and how to do so on their SIS.

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 Response	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
No Response	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
No Response	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No Response	Other Specify 1
No Response	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.

This past year HB 298 "Parent Seminars" was passed: The State Board of Education shall:(a) develop a curriculum for the parent seminar described in Subsection (1) that includes information on:(i) substance abuse, including illegal drugs and prescription drugs and prevention;(ii) bullying;(iii) mental health, depression, and suicide awareness; and(iv) Internet safety, including pornography addiction; and(b) provide the curriculum, including resources and training, to school districts upon request.
This has enabled more of the parents across the state to become involved in what they can do to help prevent these issues.

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)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has only one eligible LEA that received RLIS funding. That LEA chose to use the funding to provide security officers to enhance a safe school environment. Initial data shows that fewer safe school violations and increases in student achievement (Language Arts proficiency at 85% and Mathematics proficiency at 87%).

2.10 Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2012-13?	_____No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified that state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	1	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		1

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)	123,200.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		123,200.00
Total	123,200.00	123,200.00
Comments:		

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 [4]

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort 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 2012-13). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	67
Asian or Pacific Islander	80
Asian	80
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	79
Black or African American	70
Hispanic or Latino	70.4
White	86.1
Two or more races	84
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	67.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	60
Economically disadvantaged students	72.9

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.

[4] The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12 ISTSLOF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved ESEA Flexibility requests 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 ED*Facts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

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[6] under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward Schools÷ report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN030 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

[6] The definition of reward schools is provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools [8] under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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 2013-14 (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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

[8] The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools [9] with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN032 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

[9] The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility.This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc.

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[10]
- 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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

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 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN034 "List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuse's report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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[11] under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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