

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

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

UTAH



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

PART I

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

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

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
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: Karl Wilson		
Telephone: 801-538-7509		
Fax: 801-538-7882		
e-mail: karl.wilson@schools.utah.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Karl Wilson		
		<u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 1:11:22 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The mathematics standards for K-12 were revised during the past year and approved by the State Board in June of 2007. The new standards were implemented during the 2007-08 school year.

Science standards have existed in Utah since 1985. The standards were updated in 1992 and again in 2003. The standards are articulated by grade-level and aligned to national standards. The state's assessment system, including science standards, had been approved through the U.S. Department of Education's peer review process as of the end of school year 2005-06 (June 30, 2006).

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah currently has a criterion-referenced test in math grades 2 - 6 and in courses Math 7, Pre-Algebra, Algebra and Geometry, with an Intermediate Algebra CRT being piloted in 2007 and 2008 to become operational in 2009; for 8th grade math, the data reported includes Pre-Algebra, Algebra and Geometry, as students have a variety of courses to choose from.

Feb-2008

Utah has begun the development of alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. It will be completed for language arts, math and science in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Utah has, in consultation with LEAs, set academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). A more comprehensive description of the process was submitted in the 2004-05 CSPR.

Feb-2008

Utah has begun the development of alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. It will be completed for language arts, math and science in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has science assessments in science for each grade-level 4-8 and high school courses in Earth Systems, Biology, Chemistry and Physics.

Feb-2008

Utah has begun the development of alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. It will be completed for language arts, math and science in 2008 and implemented in 2009.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Utah has grade-level specific assessment standards consistent with the NCLB requirements.

Utah has had an alternate assessment in science for students with significant cognitive disabilities since the administration of 2006.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	279695	272107	97.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4289	4138	96.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	8546	8278	96.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3672	3523	95.9
Hispanic	36258	34861	96.2
White, non-Hispanic	226930	221307	97.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	36214	34719	95.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24479	23637	96.6
Economically disadvantaged students	83854	81241	96.9
Migratory students			
Male	143764	139593	97.1
Female	135931	132514	97.5

Comments: Numbers include 9th grade. Data submissions via ED Facts this year have resulted in vastly different numbers in some of these areas. Also, in 2006, Utah had an additional math assessment. In 2007, this test was combined with a new assessment that was a pilot for the full test. Students taking the associated course would not be reflected in the numbers as the test only provided pilot data.

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	32723	90.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3491	9.6
Total	36214	
<p>Comments: Utah does not have alternate grade-level standards, only alternate achievement standards. Data entered both manually and via the N81 report ED Facts submission for the first time caused some small discrepancies between some of the numbers. We will work out the few remaining problems for next year's submission.</p> <p>For AYP purposes, the state of Utah administers CRT tests for algebra and geometry in grades 10-12. Most students have taken those courses in junior high so the percentage of population being tested in high school and the pass rates will both be extraordinarily low.</p> <p>These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for Math. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only.</p>		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	324638	318450	98.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4757	4626	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	10080	9786	97.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4028	3875	96.2
Hispanic	39387	37984	96.4
White, non-Hispanic	266386	262179	98.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	38348	37403	97.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25710	24718	96.1
Economically disadvantaged students	91687	89353	97.4
Migratory students			
Male	166576	163225	98.0
Female	158062	155225	98.2

Comments: Data entered both manually and via the N81 report ED Facts submission for the first time caused some small discrepancies between some of the numbers in 1.2 and 1.3. We will work out the few remaining problems for next year's submission.

Some of the data entered last year was not correct, thus accounting for some of the difference in the percentages.

These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34800	91.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3162	8.3
Total	37962	
Comments: Utah does not have alternative grade-level standards or modified achievement standards, only alternate achievement standards.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42833	31759	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	617	332	53.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1359	980	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	598	303	50.7
Hispanic	6165	3215	52.1
White, non-Hispanic	33934	26815	79.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6135	3076	50.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4915	2525	51.4
Economically disadvantaged students	14410	9136	63.4
Migratory students	245	94	38.4
Male	21983	16389	74.6
Female	20850	15370	73.7

Comments: Note- Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42845	32732	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	617	349	56.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1359	1014	74.6
Black, non-Hispanic	598	353	59.0
Hispanic	6170	3383	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	33941	27515	81.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6132	2943	48.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4918	2557	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	14419	9369	65.0
Migratory students	245	107	43.7
Male	21993	16043	72.9
Female	20852	16689	80.0

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41065	30566	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	563	304	54.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1193	892	74.8
Black, non-Hispanic	580	311	53.6
Hispanic	5739	3125	54.5
White, non-Hispanic	32832	25826	78.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6016	2768	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4482	2405	53.7
Economically disadvantaged students	13741	8785	63.9
Migratory students	233	113	48.5
Male	20901	15512	74.2
Female	20164	15054	74.7

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41057	32141	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	562	321	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1191	909	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	578	355	61.4
Hispanic	5736	3294	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	32832	27138	82.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6006	2797	46.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4483	2457	54.8
Economically disadvantaged students	13740	9217	67.1
Migratory students	233	122	52.4
Male	20898	15620	74.7
Female	20159	16152	80.1

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39948	29010	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	572	293	51.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1287	927	72.0
Black, non-Hispanic	550	251	45.6
Hispanic	5664	2822	49.8
White, non-Hispanic	31720	24596	77.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5555	2335	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4093	1926	47.1
Economically disadvantaged students	13087	7981	61.0
Migratory students	219	82	37.4
Male	20712	15162	73.2
Female	19236	13848	72.0

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39952	30718	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	573	303	52.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1286	933	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	551	319	57.9
Hispanic	5664	2986	52.7
White, non-Hispanic	31723	26051	82.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5547	2369	42.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4096	1936	47.3
Economically disadvantaged students	13091	8477	64.8
Migratory students	219	91	41.6
Male	20709	15385	74.3
Female	19243	15333	79.7

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39577	28899	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	563	271	48.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1222	860	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	566	278	49.1
Hispanic	5506	2715	49.3
White, non-Hispanic	31568	24675	78.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5151	1942	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3536	1542	43.6
Economically disadvantaged students	12480	7398	59.3
Migratory students	218	89	40.8
Male	20319	14872	73.2
Female	19258	14027	72.8

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.8 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39565	31408	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	564	322	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1219	927	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	567	346	61.0
Hispanic	5503	3151	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	31560	26554	84.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5162	2166	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3531	1736	49.2
Economically disadvantaged students	12476	8399	67.3
Migratory students	217	112	51.6
Male	20311	15452	76.1
Female	19254	15956	82.9

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39638	31088	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	597	347	58.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1176	942	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	554	312	56.3
Hispanic	5222	3250	62.2
White, non-Hispanic	31932	26129	81.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4455	2015	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2902	1618	55.8
Economically disadvantaged students	11982	8312	69.4
Migratory students	192	117	60.9
Male	20208	15670	77.5
Female	19430	15418	79.4

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.10 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38424	31279	81.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	594	342	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1153	928	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	552	365	66.1
Hispanic	5257	3233	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	30719	26290	85.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4423	1789	40.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2994	1548	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	11881	8315	70.0
Migratory students	229	119	52.0
Male	19630	15177	77.3
Female	18794	16102	85.7

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	36915	28251	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	604	309	51.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1251	931	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	492	286	58.1
Hispanic	4811	2663	55.4
White, non-Hispanic	29636	23976	80.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3664	1449	39.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2091	860	41.1
Economically disadvantaged students	10778	7094	65.8
Migratory students	168	86	51.2
Male	18991	14319	75.4
Female	17924	13932	77.7

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.12 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37864	30594	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	612	336	54.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1271	964	75.8
Black, non-Hispanic	510	346	67.8
Hispanic	4972	2864	57.6
White, non-Hispanic	30373	25982	85.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4048	1619	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2688	1163	43.3
Economically disadvantaged students	11221	7697	68.6
Migratory students	186	88	47.3
Male	19566	15031	76.8
Female	18298	15563	85.1

Comments: Utah has seen an increase over 10% in ethnic populations and in special need populations. The difference in percent proficient for LEP students reflects a change in ELL proficient assessment and some variance in the LEP identification. Utah moved from a social language assessment to an academic language assessment and has identified LEP students with some variation. Additionally, Utah has seen an increase in students at the minimal proficient level of language acquisition. Additional attention in instruction showed gains with some groups. Also, hand entered data last year resulted in some data errors.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	30282	12558	41.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	753	217	28.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1018	354	34.8
Black, non-Hispanic	573	153	26.7
Hispanic	5184	1324	25.5
White, non-Hispanic	22653	10475	46.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5238	1551	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	442	90	20.4
Economically disadvantaged students	9331	3199	34.3
Migratory students	196	45	23.0
Male	16260	6973	42.9
Female	14012	5585	39.9

Comments: These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for math and ELS. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only. Utah has also seen an increase in ethnic populations. Utah has also moved to new academic language acquisition assessment and seen a dramatic increase in the number of entry level English language proficient students. Hand entered data last year resulted in some errors.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72528	56432	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1188	644	54.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2439	1702	69.8
Black, non-Hispanic	897	516	57.5
Hispanic	7905	4152	52.5
White, non-Hispanic	59915	49283	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6644	2359	35.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6408	2329	36.3
Economically disadvantaged students	16172	10243	63.3
Migratory students	308	117	38.0
Male	37243	27794	74.6
Female	35285	28638	81.2

Comments: These numbers are calculated using grades 3-8 and 10-12. These are the grades used to calculate AYP for math and ELS. Additionally, the denominator used to calculate the percent of students tested is the total enrollment of the subgroup in those grades only. Utah has also seen an increase in ethnic populations. Utah has also moved to new academic language acquisition assessment and seen a dramatic increase in the number of entry level English language proficient students.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	936	719	76.8
Districts	92	76	82.6

Comments: These numbers have changed very slightly as of February 15, 2008, due to some changes in appeals for AYP determinations, but there was insufficient time to upload the new data through ED Facts.

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	238	169	71.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	212	146	68.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	26	23	88.5

Comments: These numbers have changed very slightly as of February 15, 2008, due to some changes in appeals for AYP determinations, but there was insufficient time to upload the new data through ED Facts.

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
39	27	69.2

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Key Components of Utah's Title I System of Support

1. USOE has hired educational specialists that serve as the Title I School and District Improvement Team for the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). This team provides technical assistance to schools and districts, has developed the system of support, provides training, and reviews school improvement plans and provides additional support. They help to recruit and train potential school support team members and track their effectiveness with schools. The School Improvement Team works to build the capacity of local school district staff to further support their schools in the improvement process.
2. Title I schools identified as in need of improvement work with the local education agency to select individuals who comprise the School Support Team (SST). These SST members are selected for the specific expertise they have that aligns with the reason(s) for which the Title I school was identified as in need of improvement. The SST works with the school in conducting an appraisal, developing the school improvement plan, and monitoring progress throughout implementation of the plan. The SST is to work with the Title I school for at least the first two years for which the school is identified as in need of improvement. For the 2006-2007 school year, the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement was ten.
3. USOE with the assistance of the Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC) developed an appraisal tool that focuses on the factors that most powerfully influence school and student success. This tool reflects an intensive review of the research on school effectiveness. The SST and the school will conduct an appraisal and use the findings to target specific school improvement efforts.
4. Based on the information gathered through the appraisal process, the school (with assistance from the SST) develops specific improvement goals and identifies research-based strategies that will help achieve improved student achievement. The Title I School Improvement Plan is submitted to the LEA and presented to the local school board. A copy of the plan is sent to the USOE along with a request for a Title I school improvement grant. USOE Title I staff review the request for funding to ensure that the funds will be targeted to address the specific reasons that the school was identified as in need of improvement and that the proposed activities are research-based.
5. To assist Title I schools in the improvement process, the USOE provides Title I School Improvement Grants to schools participating in the program improvement process. Grants for year one assist the school in contracting with its school support team to assist with the appraisal process and planning, implementation of professional development, implementation of instructional efforts designed to improve student achievement, as well as monitoring and providing technical assistance regarding the school improvement plan. Grants beyond year one provide resources to help Title I schools fully implement their school improvement plans, monitor progress, and make revisions as deemed necessary.
6. For Title I schools identified for corrective action, the SEA School and District Improvement Team works closely with the LEA and the school to establish an SST that will assist in a new appraisal of the school's strengths and needs as well as an instructional audit. The findings from these processes are used to develop specific corrective action plans to assist the school in achieving AYP.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
Comments: For the 2006-07 school year, no Title I schools were identified for corrective action.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Key Components of the System of Support for LEAs Identified In Need of Improvement

> All districts identified for improvement must complete the district improvement plan and reserve 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development to address the reason(s) for which the LEA was identified in need of improvement. Districts in the first two years of LEA improvement are also strongly encouraged to use the appraisal system described below. For the 2005-2006 school year, the number of LEAs identified in need of improvement was fourteen.

> Districts identified for corrective action, that is, those districts that have been identified for improvement for three consecutive years, must use the appraisal system and support teams.

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

Step 1: Districts identified for improvement are notified by USOE. After verifying their status, districts will be contacted by the USOE staff and asked to participate in the selection of a district support team. The team will be comprised of at least 3 individuals with expertise in district improvement and in the areas in which the district was identified for improvement (i.e., English/language arts, math, working with subpopulations).

Step 2: The team is assembled and plans its calendar and tasks within 30 days of district identification for improvement.

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

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

Step 5: The support team members prepare the district appraisal report and share the report with the district leaders, staff, and others as appropriate and determined jointly with the district.

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

Step 7: The newly constituted district support team works with the district to revise the district improvement plan and present the plan to the local district board of education and the USOE.

Step 8: The district support team works with the district to implement the improvement plan and monitor progress, submitting progress reports quarterly for the next two years.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	09/15/07	09/15/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/15/07	08/15/07
Comments: Appeals were not finalized until 2/15/08.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	3	2
Schools	123	81
Comments: This data is correct as of 02/15/08.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	02/15/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Utah State Office of Education reserves 4% of the Title I funds allocated to the state of Utah for Title I school improvement efforts. Of the amount set aside for Title I school improvement, 95% of the funds are targeted in the form of Title I School Improvement Grants to Title I schools that are: 1) identified for restructuring, 2) identified for corrective action, and 3) identified in need of improvement. Of the amount set aside for Title I school improvement, 5% of the funds are used to support state activities in the area of school improvement.

Utah Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring apply for Title I School Improvement Grants. The application for funds accompanies the school revised school improvement plan. For the 2006-2007 school year, Title I schools in their first year of school improvement were eligible for a \$50,000 grant to assist them in their planning process. Title I schools in their second year and beyond applied for grants of \$100,000 to assist in the implementation of the activities outlined in the Title I school improvement plan.

All Title I school improvement funds are made available through an approved application and reimbursement process. The funds that have been available through grants to Title I schools have been used to contract with school support teams (SST), for professional development, the acquisition of research-based curriculum materials, implementation of progress monitoring strategies, use in data-driven decision making and planning, parent involvement, and targeted short-term student interventions. The funds available to the SEA have been used to hire school improvement specialists, professional development, and in the recruitment and training of SST members.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	7
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	11
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	4072
Who applied to transfer	29
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	27

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: The data in ED Facts file N/X010 does not reflect accurate counts. Retain the manual entry data.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 6972
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	<N
Comments: Utah does not collect any data but the last item.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 1585
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	88366	69642	78.8	18724	21.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	2349	2096	89.2	253	10.8
Low-poverty schools	3589	3029	84.4	560	15.6
All elementary schools	12115	10585	87.4	1530	12.6
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	14535	10997	75.7	3538	24.3
Low-poverty schools	19180	16322	85.1	2858	14.9
All secondary schools	76251	59057	77.5	17194	22.5
Comments: Our comprehensive statewide CACTUS teacher credential data base provides the data for this section and we have verified that these numbers are accurate. Teachers working in elementary high-poverty schools were the first to become HQ as new state and federal regulations arose. School districts are ensuring that teachers who are assigned to Title One schools are HQ upon being hired. Our numbers of HQ teachers in high-poverty schools, therefore, will continue to increase in percentage.					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are counted as self-contained classrooms equaling one class and counted one time.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	5.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	83.0
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	40.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	29.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	31.0
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
<p>Comments: Subject matter competency is determined by passing rigorous state academic subject tests in the subject assignment or completion of an academic major, graduate degree or coursework equivalent to a major in the subject being taught. Percentages in underqualified are generally comprised of people in process of taking and passing exams and/or finishing equivalency coursework. Typically teachers who are not currently highly qualified are in programs to ensure that they become highly qualified.</p>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	48.0	17.0
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment	
Secondary schools	40.9	17.7
Poverty metric used	Economically disadvantaged divided by total enrollment	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
	Dual language			
5	Two-way immersion	Spanish	50.0	50.0
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
1	Heritage language	Navajo	50.0	50.0
	Sheltered English instruction			
4	Structured English immersion			
32	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
4	Content-based ESL			
32	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			
Comments: Most of the subgrantees in Utah use a combination of programs depending on the endorsements of the personnel and the demographics of the student population.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	51003
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	44886
Tongan	1239
Vietnamese	1043
Navajo	878
Samoan	767

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: There are five other languages that make a significant impact in Utah - Korean, Bosnian, Russian, Portuguese, and Somali.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	34422
Not tested/State annual ELP	21681
Subtotal	56103
LEP/One Data Point	34422
<p>Comments: Because 2006-07 was the first year implementing a new LEP proficiency assessment, all LEP students took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time.</p> <p>Districts were given a directive to not test any Advanced or Fluent students. This accounts for 16,580 of the 21,681. We also revised the criteria for exiting. Some of the students were not tested because of the confusion about using a new assessment and exiting students based on the new criteria. 2,000 are new students who will be tested this year and 2,843 students could be moved to the one data point column.</p>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	34394
Not tested/State annual ELP	16609
Subtotal	51003
LEP/One Data Point	34394
<p>Comments: Because 2006-07 was the first year implementing a new LEP proficiency assessment, all LEP students took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time.</p> <p>Districts were given a directive to not test any Advanced or Fluent students. This accounts for 16,580 of the 21,681. We also revised the criteria for exiting. Some of the students were not tested because of the confusion about using a new assessment and exiting students based on the new criteria. 2,000 are new students who will be tested this year and 2,843 students could be moved to the one data point column.</p>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: The Utah State Office of Education is currently working with the U.S. Department of Education Title III personnel to revise and finalize the AMAO calculations for Utah. Associate Superintendent Judy Park was assured by the USDE that this information would be sufficient for CSPR reporting purposes this year.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				

Comments: The Utah State Office of Education is currently working with the U.S. Department of Education Title III personnel to revise and finalize the AMAO calculations for Utah. Associate Superintendent Judy Park was assured by the USDE that this information would be sufficient for CSPR reporting purposes this year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	5100
MFLEP/AYP grades	3455
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	16811
LEP HS/Non-AYP	8229
LEP other grades	37
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
3418	1682	5100
Comments: Utah recently revised the criteria for exiting and monitoring ELL. We are also using a new ELP assessment. This created a decrease in the number of students exited this year. It is a one year glitch and will be more consistent starting 07-08.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3230	2378	73.6	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3335	2934	88.0	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	34
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	
Comments: The Utah State Office of Education is currently working with the U.S. Department of Education Title III personnel to revise and finalize the AMAO calculations for Utah. Associate Superintendent Judy Park was assured by the USDE that this information would be sufficient for CSPR reporting purposes this year.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
6761	6761	30

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

Comments: Our immigrant population continues to grow but districts who have been in consortiums and/or districts formerly receiving Title III subgrants are opting out and this accounts for the decline in subgrantees receiving grants.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No Response</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No Response</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1795
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	7317
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	3586

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

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	34	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	34	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	34	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	34	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	34	
Other (Explain in comment box)	34	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	34	5184
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	34	1026
PD provided to principals	34	351
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	34	189
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	34	756
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	34	756
Total		8262
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/06	03/16/07	259
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

Because some of the districts and charter schools formed consortia, the funding allocations took longer than usual. For the upcoming year, the process was refined using the October 1 student count and a consortium application form; therefore, the distribution time is expected to be shortened. The estimated projected turn-around time is 139 days, which is based on the the amount of time it required to receive and process the district student counts and calculate the formula subgrants.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	81.9
Hispanic	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	88.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	80.8
Limited English proficient	69.2
Economically disadvantaged	80.4
Migratory students	79.9
Male	86.0
Female	87.8

Comments: Synthetic Cohort Graduation Rate = Graduates in 2005-2006 / (Graduates in 2005-2006 + Dropouts in Grades 7-12 in 2005-2006)

Event Dropout Rate = Dropouts in Grades 7-12 in 2005-2006 / Enrollment in Grades 9-12 in Fall 2005 excluding special education self contained students

All Students includes students of undeclared ethnicity not shown separately.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6.1
Hispanic	8.6
White, non-Hispanic	3.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	4.3
Female	8.6
<p>Comments: Event Dropout Rate = Dropouts in Grades 7-12 in 2005-2006 / Enrollment in Grades 9-12 in Fall 2005 excluding special education self contained students</p> <p>All Students includes students of undeclared ethnicity not shown separately</p> <p>If the field is blank, the USOE does not have the data necessary to perform these calculations.</p>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	8	8
LEAs with subgrants	32	32
Total	40	40
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	346	540
1	293	683
2	276	698
3	288	692
4	272	658
5	205	645
6	180	572
7	117	574
8	119	536
9	122	508
10	96	471
11	120	444
12	115	421
Ungraded	0	0
Total	2549	7442
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	180	533
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2236	6530
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	33	75
Hotels/Motels	100	304
Total	2549	7442
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	540
2	693
3	698
4	692
5	658
6	645
7	572
8	574
9	536
10	508
11	471
12	444
Ungraded	421
Total	7452

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	474
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1104
Limit English proficient students	2011

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	8
2. Expedited evaluations	6
3. Staff professional development and awareness	8
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
5. Transportation	8
6. Early childhood programs	6
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	8
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	8
12. Counseling	7
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
15. School supplies	8
16. Referral to other programs and services	7
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	1
2. School Selection	2
3. Transportation	2
4. School records	1
5. Immunizations	2
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	573	303
4	558	298
5	529	254
6	490	260
7	469	256
8	426	222
High School	929	419
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	580	280
4	561	267
5	526	232
6	475	184
7	387	191
8	406	179
High School	597	158
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

Please note that 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:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	388
K	198
1	183
2	184
3	213
4	185
5	198
6	192
7	239
8	144
9	162
10	140
11	127
12	66
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	47
Total	
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The population growth in Utah has created a construction and service industry boom in the work field. As such many formerly eligible migrant families have changed to those positions where pay is higher and working conditions are potentially better.

Another reason for the decrease in the number of eligible migrant students in Utah is the current unknown factors of immigration policies. Many program recruiters and outreach workers are reporting that many potential eligible migrant families are refusing to communicate with them for that reason and cannot therefore be made eligible.

Finally, current federal concentration recruitment and eligibility determination procedures has made the process more time consuming and we have found that in some occasions we have had to spend time reinterviewing families to determine if inconsistencies in the Certificates of Eligibility lend them to be ineligible for the program. This process of interviewing and reinterviewing has taken recruiters' time away from activities that would have previously been used to find potential new families.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	194
K	97
1	92
2	83
3	93
4	89
5	86
6	74
7	72
8	51
9	63
10	70
11	64
12	36
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	<N
Total	1173
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Utah Migrant Education Program has decreased in numbers overall (see Category 1 decreases/increased narrative) subsequently; the Category 2 counts have decreased as well. More intensive data collecting procedures through LEA needs assessments have shown that increasingly Utah migrant students are in school during the regular school term and therefore LEAs are choosing to exhaust more funds to supplement programs during that time. LEAs are reserving space for "Priority for Service" migrant students during the summer terms making the programs smaller in numbers.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 and Category 2 child count data is first collected by district recruiters in the form of paper-based Certificates of Eligibility (COE) at the time of family interview. The specific data collected on the COE form is the following: 1) Parent/Guardian data including father mother birth mother's maiden name street address mailing address city/state/zip phone number and home language spoken 2) Eligibility data including why the children moved their relationship to the parent/guardian name of the qualifying worker from where they moved to current destination description of the qualifying work the qualifying arrival data (QAD) and the type of work they intended to obtain which caused them to move and 3) student data including name MIS2000 identification number (where obtainable. The students don't get an MIS 2000 identification number if they are new students; they don't get an MIS 2000 number until their information has been entered into MIS2000) gender birth date birth date verification birth place and school enrollment date. The recruiter verifies all student data and after review re-interviews any families where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized. The recruiter submits the COE to the District Director for review and approval. Again where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized the family in question is re-interviewed and a new COE is completed. All district approved COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and signs for approval each COE. Who is responsible at the SEA for signing and approving each COE? (Initial approval is done by Shirley Cannon Migrant Ed. data specialist and final signed approval is done by Max Lang State Migrant Education Director) Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review they are sent back to the district for re-interview. Re-interview COEs must be submitted to the SEA before August 31 and the submission of new year COEs) All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian district recruiter District Director and SEA are entered into the MIS2000 system no later than November 30 of each year. At the time of data entry into the MIS2000 system any inconsistent and/or suspect data or duplication located in the MIS2000 are sent back to the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family. By the end of each program year (August 31) each migrant project must submit an End of Year Report which includes all category 1 and category 2 child counts. The aggregates of the project reports are compared to child count totals from data entered into MIS2000. If inconsistencies are found further investigation ensues to locate the specific migrant student for which there are issues and the student is re-interviewed.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 and Category 2 child count data is first collected by district recruiters in the form of paper-based Certificates of Eligibility (COE) at the time of family interview. The specific data collected on the COE form is the following: 1) Parent/Guardian data including father mother birth mother's maiden name street address mailing address city/state/zip phone number and home language spoken 2) Eligibility data including why the children moved their relationship to the parent/guardian name of the qualifying worker from where they moved to current destination description of the qualifying work the qualifying arrival data (QAD) and the type of work they intended to obtain which caused them to move and 3) student data including name MIS2000 identification number (where obtainable. The students don't get an MIS 2000 identification number if they are new students; they don't get an MIS 2000 number until their information has been entered into MIS2000) gender birth date birth date verification birth place and school enrollment date. The recruiter verifies all student data and after review re-interviews any families where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized. The recruiter submits the COE to the District Director for review and approval. Again where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized the family in question is re-interviewed and a new COE is completed. All district approved COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and signs for approval each COE. Who is responsible at the SEA for signing and approving each COE? (Initial approval is done by Shirley Cannon Migrant Ed. data specialist and final signed approval is done by Max Lang State Migrant Education Director) Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review they are sent back to the district for re-interview. Re-interview COEs must be submitted to the SEA before August 31 and the submission of new year COEs) All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian district recruiter District Director and SEA are entered into the MIS2000 system no later than November 30 of each year. At the time of data entry into the MIS2000 system any inconsistent and/or suspect data or duplication located in the MIS2000 are sent back to the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family. By the end of each program year (August 31) each migrant project must submit an End of Year Report which includes all category 1 and category 2 child counts. The aggregates of the project reports are compared to child count totals from data entered into MIS2000. If inconsistencies are found further investigation ensues to locate the specific migrant student for which there are issues and the student is re-interviewed.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the end of each program year (August 31) SEA staff is retrained on the correct data entry procedures for MIS2000 through an on-line tutorial and direct conversations with MIS2000 staff. One person is charged with data entry for each child count year. MIS2000 automatically updates each data entry period and organizes it in any manner needed.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District Migrant Education recruiters conduct all family eligibility interviews and verify all student data on a paper COE copy with duplication copies; 2 Spanish and English copies for the family, 1 for the LEA and 1 original copy for the SEA. After COE review, recruiters re-interview any families where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized. The recruiter submits the COE to the District Director for review and approval. Again where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized the family in question is re-interviewed and a new COE is completed. All district approved COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and signs for approval each COE. Who is responsible at the SEA for signing and approving each COE? (Initial approval is done by Rene'e Medina, Migrant Ed. data specialist and final signed approval is done by Max Lang State Migrant Education Director). At this time, COE data is entered into MIS2000 by Rene'e Medina or Max Lang and a state student I.D. number is generated. This is the point where a student is counted in the system for eligibility. MIS2000 allows for a demarcation of participation in category 1 counts as well as category 2 counts.

Re-interview COEs must be submitted to the SEA before August 31 as well as the submission of all new-year COEs). All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian district recruiter District Director and SEA are entered into the MIS2000 system no later than November 30 of each year. At the time of data entry into the MIS2000 system any inconsistent and/or suspect data or duplication located in the MIS2000 are sent back to the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family. By the end of each program year (August 31) each migrant project must submit an End of Year Report which includes all category 1 and category 2 child counts. The aggregates of the project reports are compared to child count totals from data entered into MIS2000. If inconsistencies are found further investigation ensues to locate the specific migrant student for which there are issues and the student is re-interviewed.

MIS2000 is a distributed database application custom designed for State Migrant Education Programs. The software allows Migrant Education Programs to enter store and produce reports on all relevant data for the students in their state including COE information school history information services performed health data as well as any other data the MEP chooses to collect. MIS2000 is fully customized to suit the needs of the state and enhancements are offered free of charge. Once the data is entered it is uploaded to the state database giving the State Director a complete and constantly updated copy of all the state's data. In order to verify the

count and before any of the tables are run our MIS2000 data entry clerk runs a snap report that is in the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list is generated that identifies all students that have the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students are merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report is run from the Potential Duplicate Students but using different criteria. A request is made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much larger. It is checked for any possible misspellings or obvious errors and we verify the COE to see if the students have the same family surname. Sometimes it is discovered that there are two COES for the same family. At that point between Rene'e Medina, the Quality Control Specialist and Max Lang the State Specialist, one of us will follow up with the recruiters. Also we run a built-in snap report in the MIS2000 database system called Potential Duplicate Students. It is used to merge duplicate students (same last and first name and same date of birth). Then a second report which uses broader criteria (same last OR first name AND same date of birth) is run. We review the electronic COE to determine if the family is the same and notify the local migrant education specialist to verify the paper COE.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 and Category 2 child count data is first collected by district recruiters in the form of paper-based Certificates of Eligibility (COE) at the time of family interview. The specific data collected on the COE form is the following: 1) Parent/Guardian data including father mother birth mother's maiden name street address mailing address city/state/zip phone number and home language spoken 2) Eligibility data including why the children moved their relationship to the parent/guardian name of the qualifying worker from where they moved to current destination description of the qualifying work the qualifying arrival data (QAD) and the type of work they intended to obtain which caused them to move and 3) student data including name MIS2000 identification number (where obtainable. The students don't get an MIS 2000 identification number if they are new students; they don't get an MIS 2000 number until their information has been entered into MIS2000) gender birth date birth date verification birth place and school enrollment date. The recruiter verifies all student data and after review re-interviews any families where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized. The recruiter submits the COE to the District Director for review and approval. Again where inconsistent data or suspect data are recognized the family in question is re-interviewed and a new COE is completed. All district approved COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and signs for approval each COE. Who is responsible at the SEA for signing and approving each COE? (Initial approval is done by Shirley Cannon Migrant Ed. data specialist and final signed approval is done by Max Lang State Migrant Education Director) Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review they are sent back to the district for re-interview. Re-interview COEs must be submitted to the SEA before August 31 and the submission of new year COEs) All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian district recruiter District Director and SEA are entered into the MIS2000 system no later than November 30 of each year. At the time of data entry into the MIS2000 system any inconsistent and/or suspect data or duplication located in the MIS2000 are sent back to the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family. By the end of each program year (August 31) each migrant project must submit an End of Year Report which includes all category 1 and category 2 child counts. The aggregates of the project reports are compared to child count totals from data entered into MIS2000. If inconsistencies are found further investigation ensues to locate the specific migrant student for which there are issues and the student is re-interviewed.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The most recent re-interviewing process for Utah was completed by Educational Research & Training Corporation (ERTC), a third-party contractor, during May and June of 2007. A decision by the Utah Migrant Education Program was made to continue the Reinterview Initiative every funding year in addition to the OME required Reinterview Initiative conducted for the 2003/2004 school year. The families of 348 migrant children were re-interviewed exclusively through face-to-face interviews in ten school districts throughout the state of Utah. A standard reinterview protocol form was created mirroring the protocol used by ERTC while working in conjunction with OME and the Oklahoma State Office of Education who also contracted with ERTC to conduct their Reinterview Initiative. ERTC hired two re-interview specialists that were independent from the original interviewers and conducted face-to-face trainings on the protocols and reinterviewing practices and procedures to be implemented, again mirroring the practices and procedures used by ERTC in conjunction with OME and the Oklahoma State Office of Education. Throughout the reinterviews, continuous phone monitors were conducted by ERTC with the reinterviewers as reinterview materials and results were submitted to ERTC by the reinterviewers.

The Utah Sampling Plan for 2005-2006 was based on the following process: 1) setting the Confidence Level and Error Rate: Records indicated that the total population of eligible migrant students in the year 2005-2006 in Utah was 4057 students. Three factors were used to determine the sample size. These included: 1) margin of error 2) confidence level and 3) an estimation of the proportion of the sample that would be available for re-interview. The margin of error that was determined by the U.S. Office of Migrant Education as maximum is a plus/minus 5 percent; 2) a sample was drawn from the total population of students from the 2005-2006 student count. The sample included only those students who still resided in Utah (i.e. at their last known address) of the 4057 students who were eligible in 2005-2006; 3) Sampling with Replacement: In order to achieve a 95 percent confidence level with a plus/minus 5 percent error rate a random sample of at least 348 students from 2005-2006 was needed; and 4) Interview Protocol: The interview protocol was developed based on recommendations by the Office of Migrant Education (OME) staff. During the Reinterview 234 of the 348 students reinterviewed were found to be eligible and 114 were found ineligible. The defect rate for the

sample was found to be 33.3% statewide. The defect rate was significantly affected by large numbers of ineligible students in one district (Ogden City). If you remove Ogden from the sample the defect rate for the rest of the districts in the state drops to 7.5% overall. It was clear from the data that some districts are much more accurate than others in recruiting eligible migrant students (at least in 2005-2006). For those districts that had the highest defect rates the main reason identified for ineligibility was students being reenrolled in the program that had not made qualifying moves (many students had not moved in many years). Most of these families were settled out and had lived in respective communities as permanent residents. This suggests that recruiters may have been making assumptions about families or they didn't understand the need to be consistent and meticulous in their certification for eligibility or they just didn't understand eligibility criteria. There was no evidence suggesting direct fraud and all ineligible migrant students found in the Reinterview have been deleted from the Migrant Education rolls and the incorrect practices that caused the high ineligible determinations have been corrected.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Utah Migrant Education Program collects data for child count one time per year (by August 31). However at the end of each program year (August 31) SEA staff is retrained on the correct data entry procedures for MIS2000 through an on-line tutorial and direct conversations with MIS2000 staff. One person is charged with data entry for each child count year. MIS2000 automatically updates each data entry period and organizes it in any manner needed.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All district approved COEs are submitted to the SEA who reviews and signs for approval each COE. Where COEs are found with inconsistent data or suspect data upon initial review they are sent back to the district for re-interview. All migrant student data from COEs that have been approved and signed by parent/guardian district recruiter District Director and SEA are entered into the MIS2000 system no later than November 30 of each year. At the time of data entry into the MIS2000 system any inconsistent and/or suspect data or duplication located in the MIS2000 are sent back to the district for re-interview and completion of a new COE for that family. By the end of each program year (August 31) each migrant project must submit an End of Year Report which includes all category 1 and category 2 child counts. The aggregates of the project reports are compared to child count totals from data entered into MIS2000. If inconsistencies are found further investigation ensues to locate the specific migrant student for which there are issues and the student is re-interviewed. A new Certificate of Eligibility (paper copies) is completed each year on every eligible migrant student by family and submitted to the SEA (Max Lang) for data entry into the MIS2000 system. Students who have had their data previously entered into MIS2000 will have an identification number already and are not entered as a "new student" into the system. Their information however is reviewed and updated if when and where it has changed from the previous year's entry. MIS2000 allows for students to be identified in the system by i.d. number name district guardian name and other indicators. Every migrant student who is listed on a paper copy of a COE is reviewed in the MIS2000 system where duplicate entries occur the most current information is saved and the older version is deleted from the MIS2000 system.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Results from the Re-interview conducting during the 2006/2007 school year were shared with each participating school district. Where ineligibility determinations were encountered districts are required to demonstrate how those students were taken off Migrant Education Program rolls. Also districts are required to define corrective actions to eliminated future occurrences of similar problems and recruiting mistakes in their individual districts. The SEA will continue to conduct Identification and Recruitment training sessions

to define specific areas to be improved and methods and procedures to improve them.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No response.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.