For USOE ARRA website

Utah Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Data Collection and Public Reporting Plan

The process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the required data or information, including:

Assurance (a): Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Indicator/Descriptor	Answer & Requirement	Development & Implementation Milestones	Date	Obstacles	Funds	Agency Responsible
Indicator (a)(2) Confirm whether the State's Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State's Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).	A: The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*. R: Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 2B.	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will begin posting the information annually. 1. Post updated information. 2. Post annually in November thereafter.	March 2010 Nov. 2010	None	None Needed	Utah State Office of Education
Descriptor (a)(1) Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation,	Q1: Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers? A: No, the State does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers. 1. Add the description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers to the Utah Consolidated Application(UCA). 2. Issue a directive to LEAs to prepare	April 2010 May 2010	None	None	Utah State Office of Education

promotion, retention, and removal.	plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Q2: Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of teachers in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal? A: No, the State does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B.	the evaluation descriptions for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2010. 3. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually. The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of teachers in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. 1. Explain the addition of new reporting requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new teacher quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	August 2010 June 2010 April 2011 April 2011 August 2011			
Indicator (a)(3) Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation	Q: Does the State request information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion and publish the information annually.		None	None	Utah State Office of Education

criterion.	an evaluation criterion? A: No, the State does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B.	1. Explain the addition of new reporting requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new teacher quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	June 2010 April 2011 April 2011 August 2011			
Indicator (a)(4) Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.	Q: Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level? A: No, the State does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B.	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level and publish the information annually. 1. Explain the addition of new reporting requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new teacher quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	June 2010 April 2011 April 2011 August 2011	None	None	Utah State Office of Education

Indicator (a)(5) Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.	Q: Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level? A: Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level? R: Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B.	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level and publish the information annually. 1. Explain the addition of new reporting requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new teacher quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	June 2010 April 2011 April 2011 August 2011	None	None	Utah State Office of Education
Descriptor (a)(2) Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	Q1: Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals? A: No, the State does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals. 1. Add the description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals to the Utah Consolidated Application(UCA). 2. Issue a directive to LEAs to prepare the evaluation descriptions for the UCA	April 2010 May 2010	None	None	Utah State Office of Education

	plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Q2: Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of principals in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal? A: The state does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B.	and for posting on our website by August 2010. 3. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually. The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of principals in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. 1. Explain the addition of new reporting requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new principal quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	August 2010 June 2010 April 2011 April 2011 August 2011			
Indicator (a)(6) Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.	Q: Does the State collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion and publish the information annually. 1. Explain the addition of new reporting	June 2010	None	None	Utah State Office of Education

	evaluation criterion? A: No the state does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B.	requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new principal quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	April 2011 April 2011 August 2011			
Indicator (a)(7) Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.	Q: Does the State collect and publicly report, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level? A: No, the State does not collect this information. R: Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B.	The USOE Educator Quality and Licensing section will collect for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level and publish the information annually. 1. Explain the addition of new reporting requirements to the LEAs. Assign the LEAs to begin development of local evaluation systems that address the principles and elements in the new principal quality reporting requirements. 2. Issue a reminder to LEAs to prepare the descriptions above for the UCA and for posting on our website by August 2011. 3. Add the description of the above for each LEA to the Utah Consolidated Application. 4. Review the initial posting and update it at least annually.	June 2010 April 2011 April 2011 August 2011	None	None	Utah State Office of Education

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

The Utah State Office of Education (USOE), under the direction of the Utah State Board of Education is responsible for the development, execution and oversight of the plan. The Utah State Board of Education is charged in the Utah State Constitution with general control and supervision of public school education. The Board of Education authorizes and oversees the work of the USOE. The USOE acts as the SEA in all public education related matters. USOE is the responder to all federal and state programs and initiatives. USOE provides leadership, compliance oversight, and service to all LEAs.

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

With the exception of possible technical assistance from the Southwest Comprehensive Center, USOE will not seek technical assistance from any outside agencies. In 2005, the U.S. Department of Education selected WestEd as the agency to operate the Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC). The SWCC provides technical assistance to state education agencies to implement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The SWCC works collaboratively with the states of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah to help all children achieve to high standards.

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan.

We will not receive any additional funds for this plan. The reporting will fit into existing reporting efforts.

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Our approved plan will be posted to our ARRA website at http://www.schools.utah.gov/arra/reporting.aspx. Progress will be indicated by noting when each milestone is reached both on the plan and via a press release in the "Department News" section of our home page at http://www.schools.utah.gov, with each release archived to form a historical record.

Assurance (c): Standards and Assessments

Indicator/Descriptor	Answer & Requirement	Development & Implementation Milestones	Date	Obstacles	Funds	Agency Responsible
Indicator (c)(11) Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.	Q: Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(11))? A: USOE has done limited work on matching students across the K-12 and postsecondary ranges, but the information generated has been somewhat unreliable due to incomplete and lower quality data. Much of the source data are self-reported by the students when they enroll in higher education and are not as complete as data from a longitudinal system in which K-12 and postsecondary would be directly exchanging data. **ARRA SLDS** grant funds will develop or improve this element. R: Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect	Most of these data (e.g. grades, scores, exit, transfer, dropout, completion) are included in the existing USOE and USHE/UCAT datasets but they have not be integrated into one common dataset. Other data such as college readiness scores, behavior indicators, and teacher information will be added to the K-12 system and the UDADS. The Utah 2009 SLDS grant application brings several state agencies together, first to share their de-identified data, and then to coordinate analyses and research using those data. 1. The USOE will work with partner State agencies to build necessary data infrastructure to conduct data analysis and research.	2010-11	If we do not receive the SLDS grant, this project will not go forward.	$7,467,814 State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS)Grant	Utah State Office of Education

	and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.	2. The USOE and partner agencies will populate data share and begin analysis and research. 3. The USOE and partner agencies will continue to expand data sharing and individual and collaborative data analysis and research.	2012 2013			
Indicator (c)(12) Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.	Q: Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(12) ? A: The K-12 USOE Data Warehouse currently has complete information about the courses taken by each student, the standardized assessment for the courses with the student's scores, and the teacher(s) of the class. The USHE and UCAT data warehouses have similar information about student courses and success/failure in postsecondary education. In addition, students in some LEAs take ACUPLACER to address their readiness for concurrent Enrollment classes. **ARRA SLDS** grant funds will develop or improve this element.	Under the ARRA SLDS grant work these data will be matched student by student within the UDADS to allow for much more extensive and reliable analysis and research into the questions about alignment of curriculum and preparation for postsecondary education. In addition, the grant will allow for the definition, collection, management and use of more information about the instructional settings and methods. To accomplish this end, USOE will improve vertical SSID/SIS integration through automated assignment of statewide student identifiers to supplement and replace current batch system.		If we do not receive the SLDS grant, this project will not go forward.	$600,000 State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS)Grant	Utah State Office of Education

		1. The USOE and LEAs will modify systems to accommodate the new automated processes. **2.** The USOE and LEAs will test and begin using the system. **3.** The USOE and LEAs will continue to use and perfect the system. **4.** On-going use.	2010-11 2012 2013 2014			

Assurance C

Indicator (c)(4) Has the State, within the last two years, completed an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

X Yes, this has been completed within the last two years.

X The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

- Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/documents/Special_Needs_Accommodations_Policy.pdf

This document is updated annually on the basis of an annual analysis of "the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations" for special education, limited English proficient, and 504 students. The analysis includes reviewing feedback from the field, current research and data from annual LEA monitoring.

Indicator (c)(5), (c)(8)

(5) The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

- Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/info_ela.aspx

- For indicator (c)(5) part 1 and 9 the explanation for difference in the calculations between the values at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabiliation/indicator-c5r.xls is as follows.

The calculations for these two reports included minimal variances.
The calculations for the AYP report included students who have exited this status in the last two school years. The calculations for the state stabilization report did not.

- For indicator (c)(5) part 4 and 12 and indicator (c)(8) part 4 and 12 the response is below.

http://www.schools.utah.gov/main/DATA-STATISTICS/Accountability/Accountability-Reports.aspx
select 2008-2009 and State/District (State of Utah). Generate Report Select AYP Grades 3-8 2008-2009. 2nd page of report.

(8) The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

- Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13] http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/info_ela.aspx

- For indicator (c)(8) part 1 and 9 the explanation for difference in the calculations between the values at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabiliation/indicator-c8r.xls is as follows.

The calculations for these two reports included minimal variances.
The calculations for the AYP report included students who are in monitored status in the last two school years. The calculations for the state stabilization report did not.

Assurance (d): Supporting Struggling Schools

The current reporting criteria and definitions for struggling schools are described below. They will be updated as needed when Utah receives approval for the school improvement grant.

Indicator (d)(1) Annual reporting of reading/language arts scores

The state of Utah collects and publicly reports the number of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on school gains in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup in reading/language arts. This information is available on the USOE Assessment and Accountability web page.

Indicator (d)(2) Annual reporting of mathematics scores

The state of Utah collects and publicly reports the number of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on school gains in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup in mathematics. This information is available on the USOE Assessment and Accountability web page.

Indicator (d)(1) Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools"

Tier I

- Title I served schools
- In Title I improvement, corrective action, or restructuring
- Lowest 5 schools or 5%, whichever is greater (For Utah, 5 schools)
    - Utah used the combined reading/language arts and mathematics four-year average of state end-of-level core curriculum testing for the whole school to determine the lowest performing schools.

Tier II

- Title I eligible (served or not) secondary schools
- Lowest 5 schools or 5%, whichever is greater (For Utah, 7 schools)
    - Utah used the combined reading/language arts and mathematics four-year average of state end-of-level core curriculum testing for the whole school to determine the lowest performing schools;

      OR

      Less than 60% graduation rate. The state of Utah used the four-year average of the "all students" graduation rate based on the "cohort" definition. *For Utah, no high schools were identified solely based on the below 60% graduation rate.*

Indicator (d)(3) Number and identity of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools

In Utah, five (5) schools meet the criteria for Tier I:

Midvale Elementary in Canyons School District
Northwest Middle School in Salt Lake School District
Redwood Elementary in Granite School District
Hillsdale Elementary in Granite School District
Oquirrh Hills Elementary in Granite School District

Indicator (d)(4) Title I persistently lowest-achieving schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.

- Utah has one Title I persistently lowest-achieving schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year. During the 2008-09 school year, West Middle School (grade 6 through 8) in Uintah School District was closed and reopened with a new grade span configuration, new principal, and replacement of more than half of instructional staff. The new school is Eagle View Elementary and serves grades pre-K through 8.

Indicator (d)(5) Number and identity of the secondary schools that are eligible for Title I that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools (To align the SFSF definition with the most recent Title I ARRA SIG guidance, Utah is considering both Title I served and eligible, but not served secondary schools)

- In Utah, seven (7) schools meet the criteria for Tier II:

  Washington High (Title I) in Ogden School District
  Logan South Campus (Title I eligible, not served) in Logan School District
  Navajo Mountain High (Title I) in San Juan School District
  Whitehorse High (Title I) in San Juan School District
  Monument Valley High (Title I) in San Juan School District
  Granger High (Title I eligible, not served) in Granite School District

Independence High (Title I eligible, not served) in Provo School District

Indicator (d)(6) Persistently lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.

- Utah has one secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive Title I funds, that has voluntarily initiated the transformation model. That school is Granger High School in Granite School District.