

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Adult Education**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Assist LEAs and non-profit community-based literacy programs to fulfill their missions by providing school districts and qualified non-profit community based literacy programs with funding and technical assistance for:

1. The advancement of basic literacy skills, English acquisition, and high school and/or GED completion instruction;
2. Post-secondary and career and awareness and transition services to qualified persons 16+ years of age.
3. Working partnerships in meeting the education needs of clients served by mandatory partners - Department of Workforce Services (DWS), Office of Rehabilitation (USOR) and Higher Education

Programs:

1. Basic literacy instruction to qualified students who are academically below the
1. 9.0 grade level instruction in reading, math and written language
2. English as a second language instruction to non-native English speakers
3. Civics instruction for non-native English speakers
4. High school completion or General Education Development (GED) test preparation instruction

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Utah State Statutes: 53A-15-401-404; 53A-17a-119

Utah State Board Rule: R277-733

Federal: Workforce Investment Act Title II (1998)(Sec 203 Adult Education Family Literacy Act (AEFLA))

1. Ensure that all adult education programs are in compliance with state and federal law
2. Calculate and distribute program funds to:
  - A. School districts. MSP funds distributed on an outcomes-based formula
  - B. School districts and qualified non-profit, community-based literacy programs receive AEFLA competitive grant funds
3. Provide technical assistance and program and data monitoring to ensure rule compliance and set targets and recognize accomplishment.
1. 4. Develop, house and operate the centralized student record management system. The system ensures accurate data are collected and reported by student.
4. Monitor state and federal adult education funds through the reimbursement of qualified

expenses, and from the LEA Annual Financial/Annual Program Report.

5. Conduct desk and on-site program audits

**State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:**

1. State:
  - A. UTREX graduation data for Higher Education and DWS
  - B. Out-of-school youth graduation/completer outcomes for K-12 reporting reducing the state's dropout rate
2. Federal: Workforce Investment Act Title II (1998)(Sec 203) Adult Education Family Literacy Act

Develop and maintain adult education centralized real-time database for collecting and reporting of statewide outcomes including:

- a) Student demographic information
- b) Student labor status at the time of enrollment
- c) Academic grade level advancements
- d) School diploma and GED completers
- e) Students who entered post-secondary and/or career training programs
- f) Students who entered employment
- g) Students who retained or advanced their employment
- h) Students obtaining citizenship
- i) Students who are removed from public assistance

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

1. State/centralized collection and reporting of program data and outcomes
2. Consistency of program standards implemented and maintained statewide
3. Technical assistance as requested or required
4. Maintenance of regulatory compliance
5. Professional development available to all based on need and monitoring findings
6. All programs have the same vision, focus and goals that allow students to move from one program to another with the same expectation/standard of program offerings and expectations of service delivery.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds MSP	\$9,000,000
• State Mineral Lease	\$ 149,900
• Federal Funds WIA/AEFLA	\$ 3,169,893
• Other (Describe):	\$ 0
Total Funding	<hr/> \$12,319,793

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs (State MSP) .50 FTE	\$48,348
• Personnel Costs (St. Mineral Lease) 1.75 FTE	\$93,747
• Personnel Costs (Federal WIA/AEFLA) 3.50 FTE	\$186,308
• Travel Expenses State MSP	\$497
• Travel Expenses State Mineral Lease	\$3,851
• Travel Expenses Federal WIA/AEFLA	\$11,641
• Current Expenses State MSP	\$375
• Current Expenses State Mineral Lease	\$40,770
• Current Expenses Federal WIA/AEFLA	\$31,567
• Other Charges Indirect Costs State MSP	\$5,947
• Other Charges Indirect Costs State Mineral Lease	\$11,531
• Other Charges Indirect Costs Federal WIA/AEFLA	\$17,513
• Total Costs	\$452,095

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

1. Loss of regulatory function and therefore compliance and federal AEFLA funds
2. Loss of ability to meet Maintenance of Effort for potentially awarded federal AEFLA funds
1. funds
2. Loss of program continuity and ability for programs to best meet the needs of the
3. community
4. Loss of centralized adult education student level database
5. Potential for program funding inequities
6. Without centralized oversight, coordination, and management, the distribution of funds would cease.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

1. Non-duplicated monitoring services by 51 programs
2. Consistency of all programs ensuring that student needs are consistently met and reported across the state through the management of a statewide data base. Data includes reporting of diplomas, GEDs® and academic advancement outcomes

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

Activities by USOE staff ensure compliance and delivery of a quality education system to students who would otherwise go without, unable to afford the cost of private education. The results would be:

1. A state less likely to meet the governor's goal of increasing the number of well-educated and qualified workforce members by 2020.
2. Economic loss statewide due to fewer well educated persons, decreased productivity and ultimately state and local tax collections.
3. An increase in the number of persons accessing and relying on income assistance.
4. Adult students unable to receive a high school diploma, and therefore unable to enroll in a post-secondary institution or obtain employment that commands more than minimum wage.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

1. At a minimum - increase district and non-profit community based program staff to (sample projection based on program x FTE cost = total):
  - a. Complete program compliance monitoring (51x \$75,000 = \$3,825,000)
  - b. Maintain data management, student record compliance (51 x \$150,000 =
  - c. \$7,650,000)
  - d. Offer required professional development (including test administration training and recalibration; curriculum development and standardization at a minimum 51 x 75,000 = \$3,825,000)

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

1. Using 2010 adult education data, GED recipients earned 16.9% more than a high school dropout and an adult education high school diploma recipient earned 24.4% more.<sup>1</sup>
2. Increase in academic levels affects the labor market participation through both taxpayer expenditure and revenue. On the expenditure side increased employment reduces taxpayer expenditures on human services, corrections, courts, employment and family services as well as health services expenditures. An increase in education and subsequent employment increases sales tax, income tax and corporate taxes.<sup>2</sup>
3. Successful student outcomes impact the community and state long term. Adult education data trends show an increase in achieved outcomes by students entering employment, retaining/improving employment, obtaining a GED® or high school diploma or entering post-secondary or career training programs. This is evident in the 2010 - 2011 Utah National Reporting System report that shows that 40% of students who set the goal to enter employment were successful, 91% either retained or improved their employment status; 49% of adult education students setting a high school completion goal either obtained a GED® or adult high school diploma; and 9% who set the goal for attending a post-secondary or a career training program were successful.<sup>3</sup> *(Note: These outcomes are significant from the 2007-2008 - first year data was maintained in a centralized adult education database and data was matched with DWS and higher education databases - when outcomes reflected 20% of students entered employment; 80% retained or improved employment; 32% completed at GED® or adult high school diploma and 6% entered post-secondary or career training*

programs.)

4. Workers without a high school diploma earn a median income of \$20,250 compared to \$27,960 with a high school diploma and compared to \$48,100 for those with a bachelor's degree.<sup>4</sup>
5. Graduating from high school decreases the likelihood of welfare by 77%.<sup>5</sup>
6. Each Adult Education Secondary Diploma and Utah High School Completion Diploma generates nearly \$5,215 in state income taxes annually.<sup>6</sup>

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

Costs: \$452,095

Net Benefit: \$11,867,698

Benefit/Cost: 26

<sup>1</sup> American Community Survey, PUMS Data, Utah, 2010

<sup>2</sup> Economic Effects of Adult Education in Utah, Richard Fowles, University of Utah, 2012

<sup>3</sup> Utah Office of Vocational and Adult Education National Reporting Systems 2010 annual report

<sup>4</sup>Source: [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09\\_385.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_385.asp)

<sup>5</sup>Source [http://www.caputah.org/uploads/325866\\_Education.pdf](http://www.caputah.org/uploads/325866_Education.pdf)

<sup>6</sup>Source <http://jobs.utah.gov/wi/pubs/specialreports/utahhsdropouts08.pdf>

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Assessment and Accountability**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Utah State Office of Education Assessment and Accountability Department section is responsible for the following:

- Oversight of all Federal and State Mandated Assessments for approximately 500,000 students across Utah in grades 1-12. Approximately 1,200,000 assessments are administered annually.
- Oversight of the creation and distribution of required federal and state accountability reports.
- Collection, correction and distribution of all assessment data. Public and LEA data access is provided through the Public School Gateway, and the Data Display.
- Implementation of the formative assessment tool, UTIPS and its replacement, SAGE formative assessment used by teachers in grades 1-11 in the subjects of Language Arts, Math and Science.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The assessment section oversees the development, production, distribution and administration of all of the following assessments required by state or federal regulations.

**Assessments:**

- Computer adaptive assessments in grades 3-12 in language arts, mathematics, science
- Alternate assessments for severely disabled students in grades 1-12 in language arts, mathematics and science
- Direct Writing Assessment in grades 5 and 8
- Individual reading assessment in grades 1-3
- English language proficiency assessment in grades K-12

**Regulations:**

- 20 USC 6311, SEC. 1111 (b) (3) Academic Assessments.
- 20 USC 6311, SEC. 1111 (b) (7) Assessment of English Language Proficiency.
- 53A-1-606.7. State Board of Education required to contract for a diagnostic assessment system for reading.
- 53A-1-607. Scoring -- Reports of results.
- 53A-1-904. No Child Left Behind -- State implementation
- R277-402. Online Testing
- R277-403. Student Reading Proficiency and Notice to Parents
- R277-404. Requirements for Assessments of Student Achievement
- R277-473. Testing Procedures

- House Bill 15 (2012) Statewide Adaptive Testing

**State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:**

Utah Comprehensive Assessment System (UCAS) reports  
Annual Measurement Achievement Objectives (AMAO) reports

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

Assessments created, administered and scored by the section provide both summative and formative data to state personnel, legislators, district superintendents, principals, teachers, students and parents. Provided valuation, reporting and data systems allows all educators in the state to make informed decisions on how to adjust curriculum and instruction to improve student learning.

The work of the Utah State Office of Education Assessment and Accountability section benefits all students in the state by providing teachers, students and parents with data that allow them to adjust curriculum, instruction and learning to: meet individual student needs, maximize progress in the Utah Core Standards, graduate/complete school with academic and life skills, and work toward further education or careers.

School staff are provided with professional development on how to use data to inform instruction and select interventions that may be used with a wide population of students, thereby allowing more students to succeed in school and be prepared for career and college. The public interacts with educated students who leave school with functional and academic skills, reducing the need for later reliance on state/federal programs or funds.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 23,980,084.00 (SB 59, HB 15, Electronic Elementary Reading tool and Online technology funds)
• Federal Funds	\$ 7,205,026.59
• Other (Describe):	\$ 177,793.80 (Mineral Lease Funds)
Total Funding	\$ 31,362,904.39

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 1,547,472.06
• Travel Expenses	\$ 30,389.44
• Current Expenses	\$ 27,054,441.22
• Other Charges	\$ 2,730,601.67
Total Costs	\$ 31,362,904.39

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

All the major deliverables provided by the Assessment and Accountability section are required by federal and/or state regulations. Failure to provide these required assessments and accountability reports and the associated services would place Utah in non-compliance with federal regulation impacting federal funding and potentially generating federal fiscal penalties.

The assessments and accountability reports provide the information necessary for legislative and public oversight of the educational system. Without this information appropriate review and oversight of the education budget would not be possible.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Cost savings are realized through a single state development of assessments which allows the initial large fixed cost of assessments to be distributed over the entire student population of the state. The cost per student for assessments is significantly reduced as the number of students per assessment increases. If LEAs were required to provide the assessments, the fixed cost for each assessment would be borne separately for each LEA which would dramatically increase the per-student cost of the assessment.

Total cost of assessments provided by the state:

\$12.6 million

Estimated cost of assessments if procured separately by each LEA:

\$45 million

Estimated savings:

\$32 million

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Accurate data and accountability reports allow policy makers to ensure the most efficient expenditure of educational dollars.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

If LEAs were responsible for procuring the required state and federal assessments the estimated cost would be an additional \$32 million dollars.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The Assessment and Accountability section provides all federal and state required assessments and accountability reports in an efficient and cost effective manner. The section partners closely with other USOE departments to provide high quality services to LEAs. The resulting assessment data and accountability reports provide policy makers, educational leaders, teachers, parents and students with the critical information necessary to monitor and improve performance of the educational system at all levels from individual student to the state level.

Benefit/Cost: 19 - 39

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Beverly Taylor Sorensen Arts Learning Program**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Beverly Taylor Sorensen Arts Learning Program (BTSALP) provides fine arts instruction for children through collaborative planning, side-by side teaching and professional development in 131 schools. The program was created to enhance the social, emotional, academic, and arts learning of students in kindergarten through grade six by integrating arts teaching and learning into core subject areas. The placement of arts in elementary education can impact the critical thinking of students in other core subject areas, including mathematics, reading, and science. The section Fine Arts specialist provides oversight for implementation and compliance of the program.

The BTSALP model includes four primary areas of focus:

**Integration of Arts** into core subject areas as a strategy for improving the academic, social, emotional, and arts education of students in elementary schools.

**Collaborative Planning** time occurs as arts specialists and classroom teachers work together to design lessons that intentionally integrate the art core standards with other core subject matter.

**Side-by-Side Teaching** occurs when the arts specialists and classroom teachers blend their expertise to conduct lessons together to improve students' engagement and mastery of subject matter.

**Professional Development** is designed to provide mentoring and on-site visits in which Professional Development Partners (PDPs) observe classrooms and offer feedback about lessons, provide additional resources, and instruct classroom teachers.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code: 53A-17a-162. Implementation is governed by Board Rule R277-490.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

BTSALP implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Collect and report participating student data
- Prepare and implement policy and procedures to ensure compliance with 53A-17a-162 and Board Rule R277-490
- Monitor school compliance
- Ensure that all educators working with students are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Provide Technical assistance to teachers, principals, professional development providers and LEAs
- Act as a liaison with state fine arts groups and the Beverly Taylor Sorensen Arts Foundation
- Ensure completion of performance plans and reports
- Provide general supervision of program compliance, fiscal compliance, and issue resolution

- Oversee professional development to BTSALP participants
- Manage communication and completion of assignments
- Coordination with other fine arts programs
- Calculate and distribute funding
- Monitor use of funds
- Accept and process applications for program participants
- Provide professional development for LEA leaders

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to complete an annual report to the legislature and to provide additional reports and information upon request. The annual report includes:

- A third party evaluation
- A longitudinal, mixed method study that includes systematic analysis of
  - Increased student academic achievement
  - Increased student engagement in learning
  - Increased enthusiasm for the arts
  - Positive changes in students' behavior
  - Increased participation in class activities
  - Willingness to try new things
  - Improved rates of student attendance
  - Increases in student confidence and positive gains in social-emotional development
- Fidelity of implementation

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

BTSALP benefits elementary students, their teachers and the public at large. The most recent new findings on third grade test results for students participating in the program includes:

- Students performed approximately six tenths of a point better on language arts CRTS for each year that a school implemented the BTSALP.
- Students in schools participating in the BTSALP all four years scored an average 2.2 points higher on language arts CRTs than students in schools that did not participate in the program.
- Students performed approximately eight tenths of a point better on math CRTs for each year that a school implemented the BTSALP program.
- Students in schools participating in the program all four years scored an average 3.1 points higher on math CRTs than students in schools that did not participate in the program.

Evaluations are being conducted by the Utah Education Policy Center. The evaluation is a longitudinal, mixed method study that includes systematic analysis of interviews, focus groups, surveys, activity logs, and student achievement data. The full technical report from last year is available upon request. Findings from the study include:

- There was a positive, statistically significant relationship between language arts, mathematics, and science CRT scores and levels of implementation of the BTSALP model.
- Additional observed benefits for students include:
  - Increased student engagement
  - Increased enthusiasm for the arts
  - Positive changes in students' behavior
  - Increased participation in class activities
  - Willingness to try new things
  - Improved rates of student attendance
  - Increases in student confidence and positive gains in social-emotional development
  - Parents and teachers pointed to BTSALP as encouraging and promoting:
    - ✓ Valuable life skills such as collaboration and public speaking
    - ✓ Increased opportunities to develop relationships with peers, respect for one another's work, and increased opportunities to participate in performances
- Strengthening of the school community
- Increased parent and community engagement
- Increased parent attendance at arts-related events
- Improved teacher collaboration and morale
- Expanding partnerships with community artists and arts organizations

***“Certainly the bringing together of the school community and the parent community is one of the best examples of success. Our school bulges at the seams with support from parents, grandparents and others who come to celebrate their child’s learning through the arts. The arts unite us in one large community of learning. It’s beautiful.”(Participant quote)***

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul>	\$4,000,000 for 2013-2014 \$ \$ <hr/>
Total Funding	<hr/> \$4,000,000

***Section Costs:***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> </ul>	\$109,675.64 \$ 4,843.54 \$ 14,038.48 \$ 4,694.40
Total Costs	\$133,252.06

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

Failure of the section to provide the above services would result in the USOE being noncompliant with Utah Legislative direction, the inability of LEAs to implement the program and a loss of \$4,000,000 in services to Utah children. BTSALP oversight and implementation as outlined in statute and Board rule require the efforts of a qualified staff member working in concert with trained and assisted teachers, principals, providers and LEA staff. The loss of the program would impact students and communities who are benefiting from the program which could result in reduced achievement and engagement.

*...BTSALP and Individual arts specialists suffer when plans for funding are at stake: "We would love to have our arts specialist feel secure in her position from year to year. Every year we fear that we will lose our very valuable teacher due to budget cuts. (Teacher , End of Year Survey)*  
*"When it was found out that BTS was funded I was merrily serenaded by six of my teachers—and ever since the kids and I seem to be getting more compliments about our work. The BTS funding notice raised the spirits and morale of our staff at a time when both were sinking...(Principal, End of Year Survey) (UEPC, Page 113)*

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

33 Utah LEAs receive significant cost savings from the work of the Teaching and Learning section and services associated with BTASLP, including:

- Technical Assistance (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Planning and coordination of Fine Arts programs (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Monitoring (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Professional Development (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Grant allocation and management (\$10,000 per LEA)

These amounts are estimated based upon current costs and the current economy of scale.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

LEAs are able to avoid individual program costs amounting to \$50,000 each or 33 times \$50,000 which equals \$1,815,000. The work of the section ensures integrity to the purpose and implementation of the legislative funding at minimal financial cost.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

\$50,000 per LEA or \$1,815,000 statewide.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

USOE received \$4,000,000 for implementation of the Beverley Taylor Sorenson Arts Learning Program. The work of this section allows LEAs to focus on working with students and teachers, rather than using their finite resources for program responsibilities. This has allowed USOE to help build an effective Fine Arts program for elementary students. The section is efficient and has ongoing contact with all LEAs, program providers and arts groups allowing for frequent and timely responses to LEA needs.

***Overall benefits related to program implementation:***

- Positive changes in achievement
- Positive changes in school climate and culture
- Improvement in teacher morale
- Feelings of school community within the building
- Improved physical appearance of the building
- Community and parent involvement and engagement in the school
- Arts specialists contribute to mentoring, promoting high expectations for students.
- Benefit Cost = 29

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2011 Legislature)**

**Section: Charter Schools**

**Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory Provisions fulfilled:**

Within the Utah State Office of Education (USOE), the Charter School Section is tasked with functions that pertain uniquely to charter schools, in support of both charter schools and the State Charter School Board, which is the primary authorizer of charter schools in this state. This office also advises and assists the State Board of Education, its executive officer, its staff at the USOE and in school districts, other charter school authorizers (including school districts and institutions of higher education), and the Legislature and related offices regarding charter school issues. It serves as executive staff of the State Charter School Board. Permanent assignments of the Charter School Section include:

53A-1a-501(6) - Assisting the State Charter School Board in carrying out in its statutory duties, with respect to schools authorized by the State Board of Education, including: annual review, evaluation and provision of legislative reports required by law; assistance to the Legislature and State Board of Education on legislation and rules pertaining to charter schools; advice to the State Board of Education on the funding of charter schools; maintenance of school compliance with relevant state and federal law and regulations, and administrative rule; review and evaluation of proposals to establish charter schools for the purpose of supporting and strengthening proposals before an applications submitted to chartering entities; facilitation of charter school access to private sources of financing, training and technical support; development and implementation of charter school Governing Board training modules.

53a-1a-107 – Supporting the State board of Education in carrying out its statutory duties including offering a public school choice program, giving students and their parents options to best meet the student's personalized education needs, and which emphasizes the involvement of educators, parents, business partnerships, and the community at large in decision-making at the school site.

53A-1a-513.5 – Administration of Charter school start-up grant program including: formation of procedures for applying for and awarding grants for charter school start-up costs, and ensuring that grant funds are spent only on permitted uses; establishment of a mentoring program for new and existing charter schools.

53A-1a-520 – Directing charter schools in developing an accountability plan, approved by its chartering entity, during its first year of operation; monitor compliance with accountability plans through review, written reports and site visits; establish a review process that is required of a charter school once every five years by its chartering entity.

53A-1a-522 – Reviewing requests by charter schools for revolving loans and make recommendations regarding approval or disapproval of the loan applications. Staff support to Charter School Revolving Account Committee.

53A-20b-204 – Providing expert advice and assistance to State Charter School Finance Authority regarding Charter School Credit Enhancement Program.

53A-20b-103 – Supporting, via staff, the State Charter School Finance Authority.

**State/Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by Section:**

53A-1a-507; 53A-1a-520; 53A-1a-510; 53A-1a-510.5 - Annual Review and 5-year review and evaluation of school performance; monitoring for compliance with charter and accountability requirements.

53A-1a-502.5; 53A-1a-508 – Advise State Board of Education regarding requests for increases in school enrollment or charter medication.

53A-1a-510.5 - Management of school closure, allocation of remaining assets of closing school.

53A-1a-507; US Code 107–110 No Child Left Behind Act of 2011; 53A-1-904; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; US Code 108-446, et al. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; 53A-15-301 - Monitoring schools for compliance with state and federal law.

53A-1a-522 – Monitoring charter revolving loan expenditures with Board-approved application.

**State/Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by Section:**

53A-1a-513.5 – Report on start-up grant compliance and performance.

53A-1a-507; 53A-1a-520 – Report on required evaluation and review of schools.

53A-1a-513 - Enrollment projections provided to Common Data Committee yearly.

53A-17a-154 – Solicit, prioritize, and consolidate proposals for USTAR Centers Program.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

- The Charter School Section provides expert evaluation of charter school performance; technical support to persons seeking to establish charter schools; start-up grant management technical assistance and monitoring; management of the Revolving Loan program; monthly meetings for Directors providing critical information and program development.
- Through Charter School Section management of the “Charter School Mentoring Program,” the Charter School Section facilitates third-party technical support to charter schools and chartering entities; twice-yearly financial training for school business managers.
- For each new charter school opened, per-pupil educational costs are decreased given that charter schools are not funded for pupil transportation costs. This benefits school districts, as expenses of transporting students’ fall when they are shifted to a charter school that does not receive additional funding for this purpose.
- Facility financing is obtained largely from private entities, rather than from taxation of area citizens.
- State avoids costs associated with charter school closure due to lack of governing board member and school director knowledge and skill of operating a non-profit corporation, public school, and medium-to-large sized business, estimated at 3% of charter school revenue

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above-noted functions:**

- Without oversight and facilitation provided by this section, technical assistance to charter schools and to charter applicants would be provided commercially, by educational management and business management organizations.
- No oversight would exist regarding Start-Up Program funding of \$2,405,116, if grant program would not be implemented without implementation managed by Charter School Section of USOE. Technical assistance offered would not then necessarily result in or be aimed at appropriate compliance with state and federal law.
- Development of new charters, and expert assistance other authorizing entities (school districts and institutions of higher education) would not be possible, dramatically lessening the likelihood that charter schools would be founded or operated successfully. Technical assistance rendered would also be likely to be offered at a higher cost, given the ability of the Charter School Section to set standard rates for services.
- Oversight of compliance with Revolving Loan Program and Start-Up Grant Program requirements would need to be passed on to another section of USOE, as a private entity could not be in the position of assessing compliance with educational law and rule. This would lessen the charter-specific knowledge brought to bear in assessing program compliance, and would most likely result in an increase in fraud, waste and abuse.
- Expert assistance to State Board of Education would not exist, and communication between State Charter School Board and State Board of Education would not exist.
- No unbiased expert assistance could be offered to schools or charter applicants seeking private funding.
- No expert assistance to State Charter School Board, State Charter School Finance Authority, State Charter School Revolving Loan Committee.
- In 2011, the State of Minnesota reported a finding that average per school authorizer oversight expenditure in the previous year was \$20,125. Eighteen authorizers submitted expenditure reports. We utilize this herein to indicate the value of services provided by the section per school. Benefit to the state of oversight services may thus be valued as \$2,636,375.
- \$60,000 per school private sector consulting assistance completing the Charter Application; training and assistance through the application process; corporate establishment and administration; budget forecasting; financial set-up and reporting; bookkeeping and records management (\$10,000\* average of twelve schools per year) at a total benefit of \$120,000
- Total value of Savings not including pass-through to external entities charged with technical assistance to schools, \$2,756,375.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

Costs for commercially available services:

- Costs to charter school applicants for technical support and application evaluation estimated at \$10,000 per applicant (\$140,000 in FY13).
- Costs to approved charter schools for technical support and professional development during the planning year estimated at \$15,000 per school (\$225,000 in FY13).
- Costs to operational charter schools for technical support (e.g., legal advice on facilities contract and other legal questions, monthly meetings providing updates on changes to legislation and Board Rule, training on USOE reports and data systems) estimated at \$10,000 per school (\$880,000 in FY13).
- Costs to operational charter schools for professional development for governing board members and school directors (e.g., governing board online training module library, annual charter school conference, quarterly charter school symposia) estimated at \$20,000 per school (\$1,760,000 in

FY13).

- Costs to USOE to hire program manager for state charter school start-up grant and charter school mentoring program estimated at \$100,000.
- Costs to USOE to hire staff for Utah Charter Finance Authority and Charter School Revolving Account Committee estimated at \$100,000.
- Costs to USOE to hire one additional staff for eight sections to provide intensive support to new and beginning charter schools estimated at \$100,000 per staff (\$800,000 in FY13).
- Total Benefit Value, \$4,005,000.
- 

**Total Savings and Gross Benefit:** (not including savings to educational system due to increases in number of viable charter schools): \$6,761,375

<b>Source and Amount of Funding</b>	
State Education Funds	\$579,000
Other State Funds (pass through to Charter Schools and Training Professionals)	\$2,500,000
Other (Describe)	
<b>Total including Pass Through</b>	\$3,079,000
<b>Section Costs YTD</b>	
Personnel	\$325,724
Travel	\$15,087
Current	\$82,772
Indirect Costs	\$40,064
Other (pass through to Charter Schools)	\$2,240,589
<b>Total</b>	\$2,704,236
<b>Gross Benefit</b> (see above)	\$6,761,375
<b>Percentage Return on Investment (ROI)= (Savings-Costs YTD)/Costs YTD</b>	24.88%
<b>Implications if Section were not to provide noted functions or programs:</b>	
Summary of Costs and Benefits:	
It cost approximately \$791,179 to operate the State Charter School Board in FY13, including all costs associated with the Charter School Section. The cost savings of having a Charter School Section, dedicated to providing oversight, technical support, and professional development opportunities to charter schools in FY13, including groups seeking to found new charter schools, saved charter schools and the state an estimated \$6,761,375, which would have been spent in obtaining similar services commercially or otherwise.	
<b>Total Cost not including pass through dollars to schools</b>	\$463,647
<b>Gross Savings (Benefits plus Savings)</b>	\$6,761,375
<b>Net Savings (Gross Benefits minus Costs)</b>	\$4,057,139
<b>Benefits to Cost Ratio</b>	14.58

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Child Nutrition Programs**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

This section administers federal food programs, which are appropriated under United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) regulations and administered by Food and Nutrition Services. The USDA enters into agreements with state agencies, usually state education offices, to administer the program. The State office enters into agreements with sponsors, which allow them to operate the programs. Sponsors can be public or private, non-profit schools, non-profit community organizations or camps, non-profit residential child care institutions, child care centers, day care homes or non-profit homeless shelters.

The programs are designed to provide assistance in the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of programs to provide children and low-income people with access to food, a healthful diet and nutrition education. Originally, these programs were created by Congress as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food. The programs are designed to prevent hunger, malnourishment and food insecurity.

The program provides money to pay for meals served to eligible participants, nutrition education so participants recognize a healthy diet and surplus food from the U.S. food supply to reduce the cost of meal preparation. The program's payments are made to sponsors, who serve meals to children, elderly low income and impaired adults. Higher payments are made for meals served to low income participants. The payments can be used by sponsors for expenses of administering or operating the program, preparing program meals and for the cost of food served. In some cases, surplus food is provided to the sponsors to be used in the meals. Federal funds are received by the State Office for payments to sponsors. The funding for payment for meals is primarily federal, however states must also provide a certain level of matching funds for the program.

The staff administering the program consists of one director and three teams with an assistant director over each of the teams. The school team consists of seven specialists, the child care team has five specialists and the support team has a staff of six. Specialists on the school and child care teams perform program reviews, interpret and enforce program rules and guidance, train, and guide sponsors through the operation of the programs and reclaim any funds to which sponsors are not entitled. The support staff performs activities which overarch both teams, including the payment of claims, ordering and distribution of surplus food, reviews of food distribution programs, computer support for the program operations, grant administration, report writing and secretarial functions.

Depending upon the sponsor and program, payment may be made for breakfasts, morning snacks, lunches, afternoon snacks, supper, or p.m. snacks. Payments are determined through a complex system which applies different rates to certain meals. For example, reimbursement for lunches could be at any of the following rates: .28 cents, .30 cents, \$1.45, \$2.53, \$2.55, \$2.93, \$2.95, or \$3.14, depending upon the program, the person to whom the meal was served, the location of the sponsor and the type of sponsor. State Office staff must calculate the correct reimbursement amounts, verify payments and produce reports for USDA. State staff must have comprehensive, intensive and practical knowledge of

the requirements and regulations for the 11 federal programs administered by the unit and the ability to apply this knowledge in complex and variable settings. This involves the ability to blend theory with practice; the ability to judge which rule or regulation applies to a specific setting. It also requires the ability to determine the best way to remedy a problem, situation or incident that has not been encountered before.

USDA requires regular site reviews of all program sponsors. The quantity, content and the reporting requirements for reviews are different, dependent upon the program. The State office staff is required to perform nutrient analysis of planned meals for some programs, verification of eligibility, and validation of records, procedures and claims made for meals to assure program requirements are met. Sponsor program expenses must be authenticated and measured against program requirements. Sponsors must demonstrate any contracts entered into by them conform to regulations.

USDA also requires the State office staff to provide supporting nutrition education to the sponsors through regular training. Federal regulations prescribe the requirements for the content of all meals, the requirements regarding administrative, monitoring, reporting and sponsor training. The State office staff provides training, technical assistance and oversight required by federal regulations to ensure sponsors follow applicable requirements. Training helps sponsor staff prepare healthful meals, and provides nutrition education to help participants understand the link between diet and health. There are program aids which help sponsors determine how to economically offer the meals, determine the correct amount of food to purchase, offer recipes for food preparation, efficient program management and teach techniques to prepare healthful meals for program recipients.

The USDA requires the State office distribute food to eligible sponsors. Commodities, which are foods taken out of the U.S. food supply by the government to support the price of such foods, are ordered, received, stored and distributed by our office. Some sponsors have elected to receive cash-in-lieu of commodities. Sponsors earn commodities in accordance with the number of meals they served in prior years. We estimate payments and place orders to provide commodities for sponsors who are new to the program.

USDA requires states to enter into agreements to implement, manage and oversee the program. The State office performs validation of claims for meal reimbursement, verification of program activities, training of sponsors, collection of data from sponsors, analysis of the data collected, reporting to USDA to seek payment for approved meals and expenses, payment of approved costs and monitoring of the performance of sponsors. State office personnel must have knowledge of the principles, theories and practices of education, training, food & nutrition. They must know and be able to interpret and apply laws, rules, regulations, policies and/or procedures for different programs; they may facilitate or lead hearings, meetings, teams or work groups; they control or manage and direct the operation of the program or function to which they are assigned; they must have the skills and abilities to develop approaches for implementation of an idea, program or change in operations and be able to communicate the information and ideas clearly, and ensure compliance with the contract terms, policies, procedures & regulations. Staff must be able to research laws, policies and procedures to accurately determine the correct practices, judging which rule or regulation applies to a specific setting; they must assess the need for research projects, assist with the development of tools and measurement devices, determine the appropriate methodologies, information sources, sampling strategies and analyze and review the findings to develop conclusions and improve programs.

The State office also distributes state matching funds obtained from state liquor taxes. These funds are distributed to schools on a per meal basis to assist expenses associated with lunches. State office personnel must determine the rate of at which payments will be made for meals and balance any

differences between liquor tax revenue and payments to schools at the end of the state fiscal year.

Sponsors earn money for the reimbursement of expenses for meals. For some programs, separate federal funding is made available for sponsor program administration expenses. Administrative expenses can be earned according to the type of program the sponsor is participating in, how many sites they administer, the location of those sites (rural or urban) and the economic circumstances of the residents living nearby the site. In programs without separate reimbursement for administration, the expense of management and program operation is an allowable program expense.

The State office contract terms receive management evaluations from the Federal government regularly to assess state program oversight and the payments made to sponsors. The State office contract to administer the program could be cancelled if this unit was found to be negligent in carrying out the mandated responsibilities.

USDA does not allow sponsors to self-administer the program without State office oversight. Without state administration, USDA would not allow the program to be administered in Utah, resulting in the loss of all program payments to the state and to sponsors.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The **National School Lunch Program** (Title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 210) is a federally assisted meal program operating in public and non-profit private schools and residential child care institutions. It provides payment for nutritionally balanced, low-cost or free lunches to children each school day. The program was established under the National School Lunch Act, signed by President Harry Truman in 1946. Sponsors enter into agreements to participate in programs. Our office also distributes State of Utah (liquor tax) funds to public schools for lunches.

The National School Lunch Program also offers cash reimbursement to help schools serve snacks to children in afterschool activities aimed at promoting the health and well-being of children and youth in our communities (**After School Snack Program**). A school must provide children with regularly scheduled activities in an organized, structured and supervised environment; include educational or enrichment activities (e.g., mentoring or tutoring programs). The programs must meet state/local licensing requirements, if available, or state/local health and safety standards. All programs that meet the eligibility requirements can participate in the National School Lunch Program and receive USDA reimbursement for afterschool snacks.

Schools participating in the lunch or breakfast programs are eligible to apply for the **Seamless Summer Program**. Once approved through the State office, schools serve meals free of charge to children from low-income areas when school is not in session. They continue the same meal service rules and claiming procedures used during the regular school year. The Seamless Summer Program offers a streamlined approach to feeding hungry children in the community when school is not in session.

The **Team Nutrition Program** is an initiative of the USDA Food and Nutrition Service to support the Child Nutrition Programs through giving state agencies curriculum to provide training and technical assistance for foodservice, nutrition education for children and their caregivers, and school and community support for healthy eating and physical activity. Team Nutrition awards certification to schools meeting HealthierUS School Challenge standards. State agencies review and approve applications and forward them to the regional office for processing. Schools can earn monetary rewards for each level of the certification (bronze = \$500, silver = \$1,000, gold = \$1,500 and gold of distinction = \$2,000).

The **National School Breakfast Program** (7 CFR 220) Payment to sponsors for breakfasts which meet the program requirements. This program promotes learning readiness and healthy eating behaviors. Sponsors may be public or private non-profit schools and residential care centers.

**Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program** (7 CFR 211) Payment to sponsors for fresh fruits & vegetables offered to students in selected low-income elementary schools participating in the school lunch program. This program offers a healthy snack for children. This program is different in that schools must apply for this grant. Expenses will only be reimbursed up to the school's total award amount.

**Special Milk Program** (7 CFR 215) Payment for milk for children who do not have access to other meal programs. These programs may be offered by public or private, non-profit schools, or camps. Reimbursement ranges from a set amount to the full price of the milk served to low income children.

The **Child and Adult Food Program** (7 CFR 226) provides payment for meals which improve the quality of day care for children and impaired or elderly adults and makes care more affordable for low-income persons. Sponsors of these programs include child care centers and family day care home sponsors, adult day care centers and homeless shelters having children in residence.

The **Summer Food Service Program** (7 CFR 225) provides payment for nutritious meals served in low-income areas when school is not in session. Sponsors allowed on this program include public and private non-profit schools and non-profit community organizations, including churches, camps and community organizations.

**State Administrative Expense funds** (7 CFR 235) describes the state responsibilities and procedures.

**Cash in Lieu of Donated Foods** (7 CFR 240) describes how cash payments may be made in lieu of donated surplus foods. Child care centers receive cash-in-lieu of commodities. The State office calculates the amounts. Payments are processed along with the payments for meals.

**Determining Eligibility for Free & Reduced Price Meals** (7 CFR 245) Describes procedures to be used by sponsors and verified by the State office when certifying children for free or reduced price meals.

**Food Distribution Program** (7 CFR 250) The State office makes USDA's surplus food available to sponsors to reduce the cost of preparing program meals. The State office processes surveys of the sponsors to determine how much of the item should be ordered and shipped to our warehouse, adjusts orders according to other sponsor needs, coordinates and verifies orders, coordinates the shipment and delivery of the food to lunch sponsors. The State office provides warehouse storage for foods prior to delivery and monitors that facility. The State office enters into contracts for the storage of food and delivery of food statewide. Sponsor use of commodities in meals is monitored by through State office reviews.

**The Emergency Food Assistance Program** (7 CFR 251) distribution of USDA's surplus food and payment for administration expenses to assist non-profit organizations and low income households. Sponsors in this program are community organizations (Utah Food Bank and regional pantries and food banks in Utah).

Other specific Federal regulations which the State office must follow in the administration of the above programs:

7 CFR 15: Nondiscrimination

7 CFR 225: Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments

7 CFR 3015: Uniform Federal Assistance Regulations  
7 CFR 3016: Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments  
7 CFR 3017: Government-wide Debarment and Suspension  
7 CFR 3018: Restrictions on Lobbying  
7 CFR 3019: Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations (ensure sponsors which fall into these categories use these regulations)  
7 CFR 3021: Government-wide Requirements for Drug-free Workplace  
7 CFR 3052: Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations

USDA also issues policy bulletins, instructions and guidance (all of which have the force of regulation and must be followed by the State office and sponsors). These are interpreted and provided to sponsors as needed. They cover a wide range of requirements for procedures such as providing meals to children with disabilities, entering into contracts with food service management companies and rules for procurement of goods and services.

Utah Code Section 32B-2-304 (liquor tax funding of school lunches)

Federal regulations require reviews be conducted to provide oversight of the programs. The quantity, content and the reporting requirements for reviews are different, dependent upon the program. The State office performs nutrient analysis of planned meals, verification of eligibility, and validation of claims made for meals to assure program requirements are met. Sponsor program expenses must be authenticated and measured against program requirements; State office personnel must evaluate the sponsor financial reports to determine compliance with the regulations. Sponsors must demonstrate any contracts entered into by them conform to regulations. If any aspects of the reviews are not met, State office personnel must work with sponsors to develop and implement a plan to correct the deficiencies. Follow-up reviews are often required to confirm corrections have been made. Reviews are required as follows:

National School Lunch or Breakfast: each sponsor must be reviewed once every three years (no more than four years between reviews)

Summer: new sponsors must be reviewed in the first year of operation; each sponsor must be reviewed at least once every three years (or annually, if the prior review showed significant operational problems). At least 10% of each sponsor's sites must be reviewed.

Seamless Summer: must be reviewed prior to or following year of the lunch or breakfast review. State agencies are encouraged to conduct additional reviews of sponsors who have experienced management difficulties.

Child & Adult Care Food Program: review 33.3% of all institutions each year, 15% must be unannounced; 10% of all sponsor sites must be reviewed.

Family Day Care Home Program: review sponsors with less than 100 homes once every three years and review 10% of all homes; review sponsors with more than 100 homes once every two years and 5% of the first 1000 homes.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program: review 25% of sponsors and 10% of agencies having an agreement with a sponsor. Two reviews of storage facilities are also required.

Commodities: one annual warehouse review. Commodities usage is reviewed as a part of the lunch or breakfast reviews.

State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:  
Food & Nutrition Services (FNS) 640 (report of Coordinated Review Effort, annually)  
FNS 777 Financial Status Report (quarterly)

FNS 742 Verification Data Reporting System (annually)  
FNS 777 State Administrative Expense (SAE) (quarterly)  
FNS 13 Report of State Revenue Matching (annually)  
FNS 44 Report of Child and Adult Care Food Program (monthly reports of 30 and 90 day activities and end of year close-out)  
FNS 10 Report of School Program Operations (monthly reports of 30 and 90 day activities and end of year close-out)  
FNS 418 Report of Summer Food Service Program for Children (monthly reports of 30 and 90 day activities and end of year close-out)  
FNS 667 & FNS 667 American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Emergency Food Assistance Program Administrative Costs (quarterly)  
FNS 155, Inventory Management Register (Report of Commodity Inventory, bi-annually)  
FNS 292A, Report of Commodity Distribution for Disaster Relief (submitted 45 days post disaster)  
Standard Form (SF) 425 Federal Financial Report, Fresh Fruit & Vegetables, Direct Certification, and Team Nutrition and Healthy, Hunger-Free Children's Act (HHFCA) Six Cent grant reporting (quarterly)  
Farm Service Agency (FSA)-21 Public Voucher – Commodity Programs (as needed to request reimbursement of extra charges in connection with USDA foods)  
Required by regulation to collect data from sponsors for the following reports:  
Free & Reduced Price Survey (annually)  
Racial/Ethnic Survey (annually)

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The staff of the unit is responsible for training sponsors in efficient program operation, program reviews to assure requirements are met by sponsors, payment of valid claims to sponsors and all reporting to USDA for the funds. These programs are the first-line defense against hunger and food insecurity in Utah. The overall benefit of this program is that meals and food are made available to children and older low income or impaired adults, many of whom do not have adequate resources in their homes to provide for regular nutritious meals. Utah has a high percentage of households considered to be food insecure (13%) and a high rate of childhood poverty (16%). These programs provide regular meals, nutrition education and prevent hunger and food insecurity in Utah households. In 2011, the program provided \$177,593,372 to sponsors in cash and the value of surplus foods. The cash and surplus food provided by this office reduced or paid for the cost of program meals served to children, older low income and impaired adults throughout the State.

**Detailed Lists of Sponsors, Meals Reimbursed & Jobs Funded by this Program**

There were 114 sponsors of the School Lunch Program with 927 sites. In 2011, sponsors were reimbursed 22,965,524 free meals, 5,997,125 reduced-price meals, and 28,970,274 paid meals. Severe need reimbursement (an additional two cents per lunch) is available to sponsors which served 60% or more free or reduced-price lunches school-wide during the second preceding year. In 2011, 14 sponsors received severe need reimbursement. Our program paid sponsors \$85,667,978 in federal funding and \$28,906,920 in state funds (liquor tax) for lunches in 2011. Funds received by schools were used to employ over 95 program supervisors, their staff (nutritionists, coordinators and support staff), over 850 site managers in individual lunchrooms and their staff (lunchroom managers, cooks, preparation staff and support staff). School Superintendents, business managers, principals, teachers and maintenance staff receive partial program funding due to the nature of their assignments (assisting with the service of school meals or the administration of the program). School cost of services used by the school meals program are paid for by program reimbursements (equipment & equipment maintenance, waste disposal, etc.). Indirect costs may be paid for to the extent they can be attributed to the school meal program.

In 2011, there were 305 sites offering the School Breakfast Program. Sponsors were reimbursed for 1,890,539 free breakfasts, 362,529 reduced price breakfasts, and 990,501 paid breakfasts. Severe need reimbursement is offered to sites which claimed 40% or more of the lunches in the second preceding year were served to students qualifying for free or reduced-price meals. In 2011, 464 sites received severe need. They served 6,460,826 free breakfasts, 854,529 reduced-price breakfasts and 1,299,860 paid breakfasts. Our program paid sponsors \$17,105,172 for breakfasts in 2011.

There were 31 sponsors of the Special Milk Program representing 109 sites. Sponsors were reimbursed for 424,343 half pints of milk. Our program paid sponsors \$71,835 for milk in 2011.

There were seven sponsors of the Summer Food Service Program with 128 sites. The summer program reimbursed sponsors for 1,295,752 meals (breakfast, lunch, supper & snacks) and paid them \$2,022,674. In 2011, 21 sponsors offered the seamless summer program at 128 sites served 649,495 meals (breakfast, severe need breakfast, lunch, supper & snack). The reimbursement for seamless meals is included in the breakfast and lunch totals, above (seamless means operating as if it was school year lunch or breakfast). Summer programs provide employment and pay for the salaries of site managers and for program operations with program funds. The participants in the seamless summer program usually are employed by the school during the school year. The summer program allows them to be employed during the summer months. For regular summer program sponsors, some are schools, but a number of them are community based non-profit organizations. For these sponsors, the payments for meals often mean they can expand their other feeding programs because the meals in the summer program have been reimbursed.

Surplus foods (commodities) are provided to sponsors operating school lunch or summer meals. The food can be used at other meals (breakfasts, snacks). Child and Adult Care Food Program sponsors (centers only) receive cash in lieu of commodities. In 2011, the commodity value earned was .2025 cents on each lunch served. Schools also receive bonus commodities which are not charged against their per lunch allotment. A total value of \$15,911,796 (\$326,174 in bonus, the remainder was normal entitlement) in food was distributed through the State office.

There were eight sponsors of the Family Day Care Home Program representing 2,014 day care homes. Our office reimbursed sponsors for 1,871,432 breakfasts, 2,667,235 lunches, 2,313,324 suppers and 3,848,117 snacks. Our program paid sponsors was \$17,235,439 in 2011. The program funds pay for the salaries of eight sponsor directors, their program monitors and other support staff.

There were 132 sponsors in the Child and Adult Care Food Program representing 315 sites. Sponsors were reimbursed for 1,603,167 breakfasts, 2,126,696 lunches, 303,548 suppers and 2,587,607 snacks. The total amount our program paid sponsors was \$7,505,932 (this includes cash payments made in lieu of commodities). The funds received by centers can be used to pay for administrative and operational expenses, to the extent that the costs are associated with program operation.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program provides surplus foods and administrative funds which are distributed by our office. The Utah Food Bank receives surplus foods, which are distributed to local food banks and pantries in Utah. We also receive funds to be used for administration, of which we pass through 100% to the nine regional food banks. In 2011, we distributed food for 12,236,130 meals for 1,895,548 people in 815,742 households (575,742 were under 18 years of age, 903,994 were from 18-64 years of age, 416,449 were over the age of 65). Commodity value was \$2,373,133 and our office passed through administrative funds of \$510,848.

Federal and state funding is used to pay for the salaries, benefits and indirect costs for 22 staff.

### **State Systems, Rules and Sponsors**

The State office staff knows how Federal payment systems work within the state system. State office staff knows the laws and rules pertaining to different types of sponsors. Having sponsors grouped according to their program participation and roles in the community help to create an economy of scale. Schools, child care centers, family day care home sponsors and homeless shelters all operate very differently. Training these entities in groups with other similar program participants makes an efficient operation. When reviewing the sponsors, state staff knows what types of systems to expect. For example, family day care home sponsors use different software than do schools. Staff must be familiar with those systems and be able to work within them to assure all aspects of the program are being attended to. Staff is also familiar with the federal organization of the programs and aware of reports which must be submitted, questions asked, etc., depending upon the program.

### **Food Service as a Business**

Food service operations are expected to break even after comparing sponsor food and labor costs to money received for paid meals and reimbursements received from federal and state funds. Training is conducted by the State office staff with groups of directors & supervisors, allowing for economical and efficient training. Many of the schools are members of a food buying cooperative, which reduces the costs of their food purchases. One of the schools has the capability of processing large quantities of product and can sell them to other schools, which produces large cost savings. Training schools together helps them share their ideas, sound business practices and allows them to run efficient programs which do not use additional school funds.

### **Low Administrative Costs**

The State office provides technical assistance and training regularly for program sponsors. Training for new child care centers is offered monthly. Training for new school directors is held annually. The unit has received grants from USDA which have paid for computer software to make school programs easier to administer and for training to assist school lunch programs in applying for USDA awards. Program aids teach all sponsors the best ways to achieve program efficiency and maintain low operation cost. State staff have created on-line training so sponsors do not have to travel to attend some common training.

### **Low Cost Meals**

Even meals which are offered at full price to the children are subsidized by the payments made by this program. Because of the size of the program, sponsors are able to obtain high quality foods at low cost. The meals they make are produced in quantities which make streamlined production possible. For parents, this means these programs provide a nutritionally balanced meal at the lowest possible price. Program guides require food purchases are made through procurement methods that assure competition among suppliers. Surplus food reduces the cost of producing meals.

### **Food Safety**

Sponsors operating the program are required to adhere to good food handling processes. School food service managers are trained in food safety and assure all foods can be traced back to the source of the product. Food temperatures are checked to assure hot foods remain hot and cold foods remain cold in order to prevent the growth of harmful pathogens. These practices prevent outbreaks of food poisoning. State office staff reviews monitor the performance of sponsors and require correction if deficits in performance are found.

### **Jobs**

These programs provide direct employment for more than 2,150 school staff. Partial funding can be used from the program for those with work duties assist feeding programs (superintendents, principals, school secretaries, janitorial staff and teachers). At least 8 family day care home sponsors and their staff of monitors (approximately 32) and their support staff (more than 8) have positions paid for with these funds. Food banks and regional food pantries receive funds to support their staff. Federal and state funds pay for 22 state staff to administer the program.

### **Nutrition**

Primary benefits are program payments made to sponsors to provide meals to children, older low income or impaired adults. The result of these meals is improved nutritional intake for those participants. Children and older, low-income and impaired adults who participate in federally supported meal programs have been shown to have superior nutritional intake when compared against those who do not have access to the programs. Adequate nutrition is critical for the normal development of body and brain. Lunches provide 1/3 of the Recommended Dietary Allowance of necessary nutrients. Congress created these programs after investigation into the health of young men rejected in the World War II draft showed a connection between physical deficiencies and childhood malnutrition. These programs provide access to balanced, nutritious meals which include protein, whole grains, fruits, vegetables and milk. Consumption of meals containing adequate nutrition results in better health, improved academic performance, higher levels of concentration and fewer behavioral problems. Nutrition education provided by the program assists in developing lifelong healthy eating habits. Wellness policies help schools address obesity problems and promote physical activity. These programs assure adequate nutritional intake, including calories and nutrients. The programs prevent hunger and food insecurity.

### **Academic Performance**

Children with adequate food perform better on tests of knowledge, have better classroom attention and higher cognitive function. Hungry children have more problems in the classroom and in learning. In Utah, 16% of children live in poverty. Most of the participants in these programs (especially the breakfast and summer programs) are from low income households. The food they receive helps to support their academic performance. Strong, healthy children are ready to learn and perform better in the classroom.

### **Improved Health**

A diet consistent with the dietary guidelines for America is a contributing factor to overall health and a reduced risk of chronic disease. The meals are distributed daily to children, elderly low income and impaired adults. The lunches provide 1/3 of the minimum daily requirements for nutrients and calories. Participants with adequate nutrition have lower rates of disease. Getting children on a healthy path early in life helps to assure they remain healthy as adults. Fruit and vegetable consumption is important for weight management, optimal child growth and chronic disease prevention.

### **Food Security**

Food security is defined as access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life. It includes the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods and an assured ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways. Participation in the feeding programs administered by the State office helps to shield children, elderly low income and impaired adults from the effects of a limited household food supply. The program serves nearly half of the meals eaten by program participants over the course of a week and promotes the food security of low income households. In addition, other household members may indirectly benefit if children's meals add to the household's overall food resources. The probability of children from lower income families participating in meal programs rises when local food prices increase. In summer, meals are available in low income communities and

provide higher food security for households with children.

**Lower Obesity Rates**

Families who are food secure have lower rates of obesity. When protein, fruits, vegetables, whole grains and milk are consumed in adequate amounts, participants have lower rates of obesity.

**Child Privacy & Dignity Protected**

For children in low-income households, meals are available at no-cost or reduced price. Because federal rules forbid public identification of these children, the privacy and dignity of the low income child is preserved. Not only can the child select a nutritious meal and eat with other students in a common lunchroom, fellow students don't know that child's family is low income.

**Special Needs**

Program guidance requires sponsors to attend to the needs of any program participants with disabilities. Meals can be modified to address any of their special dietary needs and program funds can be used to purchase any special foods. If a physician certifies the individual as having a disability, all meal modifications are valid program expenses.

**Community Facility**

Schools often serve as a hub for community activities. Lunchroom facilities and equipment can be used after school hours by other school or community organizations. In addition, schools often serve as emergency shelters in the event of weather related or other crisis. The equipment has been paid for using funds provided by our programs, however it can be used by others when needed. When a disaster has been declared, food located in school storerooms can be used by such organizations as the Red Cross and will be reimbursed to the school by the federal government.

**Agricultural Subsidies**

Foods used in the commodity program are purchased by the federal government to support the prices of agricultural products. Farmers who produce foods are guaranteed prices for their commodities which help to cover the cost of producing them. Warehousing foods in a central location and coordinating the delivery of food to schools provides for an economy of scale. Many schools are not large enough to receive a full truck of food, for example, and their orders are combined with the orders of other nearby schools to assure a full truck makes the trip and efficiently delivers the food.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

State Education Funds	\$ 139,500.00
State Liquor Tax Funds	\$ 29,542,165.02
Federal Funds	<u>\$134,591,126.96</u>
Total Funding	\$164,272,791.98

**Section Costs:**

• Federal Personnel Costs	\$ 1,172,073.14
• State Personnel Costs	\$ 282,205.78
• Federal Travel Expenses	\$ 42,685.84
• State Travel Expenses	\$ 1,009.26
• Federal Current Expenses	\$ 416,850.52
	\$ 415,429.89

• State Current Expenses	\$ 33,663.75
• Federal Other Charges (capital outlays)	\$ 68,763.08
• State Other Charges (capital outlays)	\$ 151,197.44
• Federal Other Charges (Indirect costs)	\$ 36,404.54
• State Other Charges (Indirect costs)	<\$29,067.97>
• State Other Charges (Recovered Audit Findings-Liquor Tax)	\$132,774,656.27
• Federal Flow-thru	\$ 28,906,920.44
• State Flow-thru	\$ 164,272,791.98
Total Costs	

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

USDA does not allow sponsors to self-administer the program without State office oversight. Without state administration, USDA would not allow the program to be administered in Utah, resulting in the loss of all program payments.

Directors at large districts make salaries far in excess of any State office salaries. They manage the school programs at all the schools in their districts. However, the cost of hiring any of them to assist with state program management would be cost prohibitive. There are for-profit entities assisting the *sponsors*, but they are very expensive and the result of their assistance does not necessarily result in a better run program (food service management companies and charter school management companies). Many times, reviews at these types of facilities result in the repayment of program funds and the need for additional sponsor training so the sponsors correctly supervise the actions of the entity they have hired to oversee their program operations. The USDA does not allow for-profit entities to self-manage the program; they may only participate under the auspices of a district and the district must retain responsibility for all program operations. There is also software used to assist sponsors in running these programs, however, it is also very expensive and is only used by the larger sponsors (PCS, RenWeb, Nutrikids, Minute Menu, etc.).

Without the programs administered by this office, the following would be the result:

**Increased Costs**

Sponsors would no longer be able to provide partial payment for salaries of school staff associated with this program (superintendents, principals, teachers, school secretaries, custodians). Schools would need to pay for these salaries using other funds.

**Decreased Food Safety**

The incidence of food poisoning would increase, as parents are often not aware of food safety when preparing meals at home. Transporting meals from home and keeping them hot enough or cold enough to prevent food borne illness is difficult. In the U.S., 5,000 people die each year from food poisoning. Poisoning sends 325,000 to the hospital each year. In Utah, the cost of foodborne illnesses cost an estimated \$1.185 billion. These rates would increase.

**Decreased Sponsor Resources**

Program costs include kitchen equipment, such as steamers, refrigerators and warming ovens. Without program revenue, it would not be possible to purchase quality equipment with which to prepare meals. Sponsors would need to find other revenue with which equipment purchases could be made for the kitchens (if schools, centers and day care homes could continue to offer meals at all).

**Decreased Nutritional Quality of Meals**

The sponsor's food service program costs would increase and the quality of the meals would decrease. Without the program guides to help them keep expenses low, costs would increase. Without uniform meal requirements, the quality of meals would be variable. This would be detrimental in multiple ways: variable program costs, quality and loss of any economy of scale in terms of food purchasing, contracts, and preparation. It is likely that the quality of meals offered would vary dependent upon the economic circumstances of the community. Low income communities would not be able to support a feeding program at all. High income communities would be able to offer programs for their children.

**Increased Cost for Participants with Special Needs**

The cost to children with special needs would increase. Without program requirements to provide accommodations, the manner in which a child's special dietary needs were addressed would be variable, dependent upon how the sponsor chooses to accommodate (or ignore) the needs.

**Decreased Participant Privacy**

The privacy of a low income child would be lost. If the sponsor was able to provide food at no cost to low income participants, it is unlikely they would do so in a way that no one else in the classroom knew the situation. Because it would be cost prohibitive to provide meals at no cost or low cost, these children would be at the mercy of the sponsor in terms of getting food during the school day if they were not able to bring food from home.

**Job Losses**

If the section did not provide the functions, the state and sponsors would lose \$161,681,576 in federal and state funding and \$15,911,796 in surplus food. That represents funding they use to purchase food, pay staff to prepare food, pay for direct expenses, such as equipment and payroll, and pay indirect expenses associated with the program. More than 2,150 school staff positions are funded through this program. More than 32 family day care home sponsors and their staff have positions paid for with these funds. Food banks and the regional food pantries receive \$510,848 to assist with program administration; without funding, those positions would be lost. Federal and state funds which pay the salaries of 22 state staff to administer the program would be lost.

**Hunger**

Sponsor ability to offer food to the children would be diminished. While sponsors could charge the full cost for meals, it is likely that families (particularly low income households) would not be able to pay for the meals. The full cost of a meal is estimated to be \$3.00-\$5.00. Most schools would not be able to provide additional funding to continue to offer the program. It is likely many schools would require households to send meals from home. Since high percentages (48-100%) of the meals in these programs are provided to those from low income households, it is likely the Utah children and adults in these households would go hungry. Child care centers and day care homes would continue to offer food to their clients, but the types of food would change from nutritious sources of protein, fresh fruits & vegetables, milk and whole grains to less expensive foods. Residential child care centers and homeless shelters would have to find other funding to provide food for their clients. Without the program, it is likely that many of the current programs would cease to exist and current participants would be hungry.

**Increased Food Insecurity and Poverty**

The 13% of Utah's population considered food insecure would lose access to low cost and free meals. Food insecurity is defined as limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable foods in a socially acceptable way. In Utah, 16% of children live in poverty. The rate is highly variable, depending upon the county. In some areas, San Juan and Iron counties, for example, the child poverty rate are much higher (21-25%). Children in counties

with higher poverty rates would suffer food insecurity and poverty at higher rates. In 2011, census data reports 138,000 Utah children lived in poverty. Without these programs, that number would increase. Poverty is the main cause of food insecurity and hunger. Without these programs for support, rates of poverty, food insecurity and hunger in Utah would increase.

Food insecurity and poverty influences child health, growth and development. The effects of food insecurity on adults in households with children can adversely impact those children in a variety of ways, including decrease of parents' energy for providing care and developmental stimulation. Parental depression is associated with food insecurity and such depression has been linked with adverse impacts on parenting, parent-child interaction and attachment, child growth, development, health and well-being. The incidence of these would be expected to increase.

### **Increased Household Food Expenses**

Without the feeding programs, family expenses would increase. In Utah, 37% of our population already spends more than 30% of their income on housing. With the budget for food increasing due to the lack of feeding programs, it is likely that more of our population would fall into poverty. When access to nutritious meals was terminated, parents would need to provide meals for their children or sponsors would need to come up with other methods of providing the meals. Children from low income households would face the biggest obstacles to healthy food choices and are at greatest risk for malnutrition. If parents were to supply the meals, the types of food provided would consist of low quality, low cost foods. Elderly low income and impaired adults who received program meals would need to obtain food from other places, such as food banks.

### **Increased Malnutrition**

Children's health would deteriorate. Iron deficiency and iron deficiency anemia are the most prevalent nutritional deficiencies in the U.S. Iron deficiency in early life has been linked to persistent deficits in cognition, attention and behavior even after treatment. The prevalence of anemia among children under five years of age is 14%. This would increase. In the U.S., children hospitalized with primary diagnoses of nutritional deficiencies had an average cost of approximately \$16,000 per child. Just one of those diagnoses alone, protein-calorie malnutrition, cost Medicaid approximately 1.25 million. Food insecurity weakens the immune system and food insecure children are more vulnerable to infections, and end up hospitalized with illnesses that their food secure peers fight off successfully.

More frequent doctor's visits, and increases in other medical expenses present a heavy cost burden to families already strapped for financial resources. Many food insecure households cannot afford health insurance, meaning that the burden of their medical costs shifts onto state and federal taxpayers. The time cost associated with caring for an ill child means missed days of work for parents, presenting cost to employers and employees alike. In the worst circumstances, chronic illnesses in children from lower-income families may cause a parent to lose a job if the job does not allow for any or enough sick days.

### **Poor Academic Performance**

Child hunger is an educational problem. Children who enter school without proper nourishment and support are at an early disadvantage and struggle to keep up with their more advantaged peers. One study found that kindergartners from food insecure homes not only entered school with lower math scores, but also learned less over the course of the school year.

Learning deficits in the earliest years of education have a cumulative effect as children continue through elementary school and beyond. Middle and secondary school year progress depends on students mastering basic skills and building on their knowledge over time. Food insecure children learn at a slower rate than their peers, and coupled with their initial delay, fall further and further behind as they

progress through the system.

Poor nutrition interferes with cognitive function and performance in the areas of language, concentration and attention and is associated with lower academic achievement. It is likely that if this meals program were not provided, children would attend class while hungry and would suffer performance deficits. Academic performance of the children would suffer.

### **Increased Obesity**

Malnutrition has two faces in the United States: the under-consumption of nutrients needed to survive and over-consumption of foods that can lead to conditions such as overweight, high cholesterol and high blood pressure. Obesity rates would increase. Households with children are the group most likely to be food insecure. Children whose families are food insecure are more likely to be at risk of overweight (more than 85% of weight for age) or obesity. In Utah, 24.4% of the population is obese. Without feeding programs to provide nutritious meals, the consumption of low cost, low nutrition foods would increase. With the increased consumption of low cost, low nutrition foods, obesity rates would increase.

Adults who earn less than \$15,000 a year have an obesity rate of 33%. Nearly 33% of adults who did not graduate high school are obese. These rates would increase. Obesity is associated with increased rates of type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease, stroke, hypertension, arthritis and obesity-related cancers. These problems of middle-age and older adults are being found at younger ages. Obese children display increases in blood pressure. Overweight adolescents have more Medicaid claims for diabetes, asthma and respiratory problems than normal weight adolescents. The total estimated medical cost in the U.S. for obesity related disease management among 6-17 year olds reached \$127 million in 2003 and continues to rise along with the prevalence of overweight and obesity within this age group. If obesity rates increase, for every 100,000 citizens, it is estimated that 8,658 citizens would have type 2 diabetes, 16,730 would have coronary heart disease or stroke, 17,790 would have hypertension, 12,504 would have arthritis and 2,468 would have obesity related cancers. The costs of disease due to obesity are very high and could be expected to increase.

### **Increase in Emotional and Cognitive Development Problems**

Obesity has a substantial negative impact on the emotional and cognitive well-being of young children. Overweight and obese children are often stigmatized by their peers, and stigmatization can profoundly influence their psychological and social development. Overweight children become overweight adolescents. Poor body image can become a major focus during teen years, and leads to poor self-esteem, emotional health problems and issues with social adjustment. Obese girls are nearly twice as likely to have attempted suicide. Obese adolescents were more likely to perceive themselves as below average students, and boys were twice as likely to expect to quit school.

### **Productivity Decreases**

Economic productivity would decrease. When obesity rates increase, productivity decreases. Obese women trying to transition from welfare to work were less likely to find employment and had lower monthly earnings than similar non-obese women. There was a 9% difference of wages. A one point increase in Body Mass Index (BMI) over time was associated with a \$1,000 decrease in net worth on average, holding other factors such as income constant. The major reason cited for this association was that overweight and obese adults tended to leave school earlier than their peers. Disease and simple inability to perform daily functions increases. If current obesity rates continue, estimates show the loss of economic productivity would be between \$390 billion and \$580 billion annually in the U.S. These costs would increase.

**Increased School Dropout Rate**

Utah's rate of dropouts is about 11% of the population. Children living in low income households perform poorly in academics. Hunger is one of the factors, poor nutrition is another, and other factors are family instability and neighborhood dynamics. One of the reasons many children cite for dropping out is that the family needed more income and they intended to work rather than attend school. Unfortunately, the jobs available to those without a high school degree are often low paying positions.

**Increased need for Special Educational Services**

Children from food insecure households are more likely to be judged to need special educational services. Children who are not only food insecure but also hungry are twice as likely as those who are not hungry to be receiving special education services and twice as likely to have repeated a grade. Special educational services cost an extra \$5,918 per pupil (SY 99-00). The cost of educating a special needs child is nearly double the annual expenditures for a child without special needs.

**Decreased Lifetime Earnings**

Lifetime earning capacity is determined largely by educational attainment. When human capital deficits (e.g., health problems) interfere with cognitive development, achievement of school readiness, learning or academic achievement, they can impact educational attainment and reduce one's earning capacity. Reduced earning capacity, in turn, reduces that person's lifetime earnings, and their economic contribution to the social and economic systems. These deficits can also have an impact on society and future generations, as suggested by the term "cycle of poverty," in which one generation's poverty present barriers to the next generation's achievement of its potential.

**Loss of Community Capacity for Emergencies**

Communities would lose gathering places in case of emergency. Without equipment or surplus food which can be used in case of a federally declared disaster, communities would need to find alternate sources of inexpensive food and the facilities to prepare the food.

**Loss of Agricultural Price Security**

Without agricultural crop support, prices would vary widely, dependent upon how well or how poorly crops and livestock did in a given year. The foods would not be available to reduce sponsor costs and the foods could cost more (or less) dependent upon how the crop fared that year. Ranchers and farmers would be paid less for their crops in good years and more for their crops in bad years.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:*****Low Meal Costs**

State agency staff pays sponsors for meals which meet the program requirements and for administrative expenses associated with running the meal programs. The program saved public schools, private non-profit schools, residential child care centers, camps, child care centers and day care homes and homeless shelters direct funding of \$ 161,681,576 for meals served during state FY 2011 and surplus food valued at \$15,911,796 for a total of \$177,593,372. These funds reduced the costs of serving meals to participants, paid for staff salaries, kitchen facilities, equipment and all direct expenses for food preparation. In addition, indirect expenses could also be charged to the program to the extent to which they could be attributed to program functions.

**Efficient Operations**

The program guides and training given by state staff allow the meals to be offered at the lowest possible cost to the sponsor. Participants in the programs receive state developed on-line training, access to program guides and manuals, and training in the use of those guides and manuals. The training assures

contracts obtain the lowest price possible for food, services and equipment, preparation methods are efficient. Program recipes assure food is not wasted and guides assure the needed quantity (and not more) is purchased and prepared.

### **Nutritious Meals**

Oversight by state agency staff assures USDA program requirements are followed. Program rules, regulations and guidance describe the content of meals which are provided under these programs. The content is based on the Institute of Medicine and Dietary Guidelines for Americans. Participants receive 1/3 to 1/2 of their daily needs, depending upon which meals they eat. Participants receive adequate nutrition to support their health, and studies show participants have better attention, attendance and cognitive functions. They're ready to learn the materials presented in the classroom.

### **Food Security**

State health department rules describe food safety requirements. USDA rules require sponsors to have Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point plans (HACCP). State staff oversight and monitoring assures program rules are followed.

The purpose of these programs is to alleviate problems of food insecurity. When nutritious meals are regularly available to program participants, it benefits the individual, their household, the school they attend and the community at large. Efficient administration assures this program works to prevent hunger in children, low income and impaired adults.

### ***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

With competent state staff administration, the programs continue to be operated in the State of Utah.

With efficient state staff administration of the program, public and private non-profit schools, residential child care centers, day care centers, day care homes, adult day care centers and camps have lower operational expenses because they are reimbursed for meals and because they have the use surplus food to make healthy meals for their participants. Sponsors receive a total of \$161,681,576 in program funds and food which they would have to find alternate funding for or cease program operations (the amount does not include the value of surplus food). Since the cost of program meals is estimated between \$2-5 (depending upon the meal being replaced), the costs of offering meals would increase. For example, if only the lunches served in the National School Lunch Program (57,932,923 meals) are multiplied by \$3.00, it represents a figure of \$173,798,769 for which sponsors would have to seek funds elsewhere. Meals from Breakfast, Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program, After School Snacks, Child and Adult Care, the Summer Program, and the Special Milk Program would also need be paid for with other funding. Other types of meals (breakfast, a.m. snack, child care and family day care lunches, fresh fruit & vegetable snacks, afternoon snacks, suppers, p.m. snacks, special milk) would need additional funds.

With trained staff and the instruction in the operation of efficient program operation to assist in controlling program costs and providing for nutritious meals on a uniform basis, school and center costs are lower.

Federal funds are used to provide meals for children in Residential Child Care Centers rather than state funds.

School costs for no-cost or low-cost meals are paid with federal funds. Without the programs, other funding sources would need to be found.

Food banks receive administrative funding and a significant quantity of surplus food warehoused and delivered by this department. Without the program, alternative administration funding and a source of food distribution would need to be located.

With the programs, the costs of malnutrition, hunger, and food insecurity are decreased.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

The USDA has no provisions for a non-state agency to administer the programs. These programs would not exist if they were not sponsored by a state agency in Utah.

**Surplus Foods**

There are no alternative programs to provide food for low income children in schools, day care centers, day-care homes or for meals during the summer. There are no alternative methods of distributing federally purchased foods to schools or to the Utah Food Bank.

**Meal Costs**

Costs of providing low or no-cost meals to children without the payments provided by this program would be cost prohibitive. Schools could have meals catered or continue to provide the meals at full cost to students. The amount spent on food by families would increase.

**Nutrition**

Schools and child care facilities would no longer have requirements for nutritious meals, nor would they have the money, meaning the quality of meals provided would deteriorate. Inexpensive meals would consist of low cost food with little nutritious content. Fruits and vegetables would not be provided.

Rates of malnutrition would increase. Rates of obesity and chronic disease, including diabetes, heart disease and cancer, would increase. Chronic disease rates are already higher in low income counties in Utah. Those rates would increase. Malnutrition in children results in stunted growth, and mental and physical disabilities.

Without nutritional support, low income children's academic performance would decline. Drop-out rates would increase. In Utah, 5-11% of students drop out of school. Students who do not complete their high school education are very costly to the State. Estimates show they earn \$7,536 less each year than students who complete high school.

**Health**

The life expectancy and health of low income individuals is less than that of middle and high income Americans. Low income Americans are more likely to use prescription and non-prescription medications, have higher rates of tobacco use and higher rates of obesity. For white females without a high school diploma, they average a lifespan is five years shorter and for white males it was three years shorter when compared to those with a diploma. The cost of a year of quality life is estimated at \$50,000 per individual. Although overall, Utah has very long life expectancy, there is great disparity in our state dependent upon the living conditions of the individual.

Obesity is an important factor in preventable death in the United States. The highest rates of obesity occur among population groups with the highest poverty rates. Most of the participants in the federal feeding programs are low income. In Utah, adolescents (grades 9-12), 10.5% were overweight and 6.4% were obese. Childhood overweight/obesity leads to adult overweight/obesity. In Utah, 56.9% of adults

were overweight and 22.5% of adults were obese. Children who are obese at age six are 50% more likely to be obese as adults. Among overweight children, ages 10-15, 80% were obese at age 25. Children who are obese are more than twice as likely to die before the age of 55. Around 70% of obese youths have at least one additional factor for cardiovascular disease. Obesity shortens people's lives by three to 12 years when compared to normal weight peers. An obese person's yearly medical expense is estimated to be \$4,871 when compared to \$3,442 for a patient at a healthy weight.

Of children who are diagnosed with diabetes, 85% are obese. In 2002, the medical costs of diabetes per person were estimated to be \$13,243 per person (versus \$2,560 per person for those without diabetes).

Heart disease and cancer rates are higher in people who are overweight and obese. The antioxidants present in fruits and vegetables are protective. Diets which are of poor quality lack potassium, calcium, vitamins A, C, and D. Overweight and obese children often show signs of blood vessel damage, which is a precursor to heart disease. The cost of ongoing care for one person with heart disease is 4.8 million over a lifetime (this figure includes diagnostic tests, surgery, hospital and doctor visits, physical therapy, drugs, and ongoing care). Adequate nutrition lowers the rates of preventable disease in all age groups. The incidence and prevalence of preventable diseases in Utah would increase without programs to assure access to nutritious meals, especially for the low-income population.

#### **Food Safety**

Food poisoning rates would increase. Currently, CDC estimates that each year roughly 1 in 6 Americans (or 48 million people) gets sick, 128,000 are hospitalized, and 3,000 die of foodborne diseases.

#### **Equipment & Community Functions**

Schools are the center of some small town activities. The school kitchen is often used for community functions and serves as an emergency shelter in times of need. Without program support to purchase equipment for the kitchens, the community would lack the capability to prepare food

#### ***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Without these programs, sponsors would lose \$177,593,372 in cash and the value of food. Over 2,204 jobs would be lost. Schools, residential child care institutions, camps, child care centers, day care homes, summer programs and the Utah food bank costs would be far higher if they had to self-fund the programs. Without funding, many programs would simply cease to exist. Children, low income senior citizens and adults with special needs would likely go hungry. Food insecurity would increase, child academic progress would suffer and a host of problems associated with poor health, hunger and poverty in Utah would increase. The State costs to administer this program are only \$774,745.

One in seven Utah households struggles with hunger. The programs administered by the staff of this department provide funds for sponsors to offer low-cost and no-cost meals to Utah's children, senior citizens and adults with special needs to protect them from experiencing hunger. Sponsor management and training by twenty-two State office staff assures the programs operate in a cost-efficient manner, following the applicable federal rules, regulations, guidance and policy and benefiting from the program aids and training. Through this program, public and private non-profit schools, residential child care centers, child care centers, day care homes, camps, food banks and homeless shelters received \$177,593,372 in cash and the value of food for meals offered in their programs. The payment for meals, food provided and the oversight and training for efficient administration of the program help to assure Utah's children, low income seniors and adults with special needs are well-fed, healthy and ready to learn. The State office staff administers, trains, oversees and makes payments to the sponsors at a cost of \$774,745. The USDA has no provision for a non-state agency to administer the programs; if state

funding was not available, the program would not exist and federal funds would not be available.

Totals	
Costs	\$ 774,745. (State costs only; no Federal flow through)
Benefits	\$ 177,593,372.
Benefit/Cost Ratio	229/1

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Concurrent Enrollment**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Concurrent Enrollment Program provides challenging college-level course work for students. There are 67 LEAs that participate in the Concurrent Enrollment program. Concurrent Enrollment provides transition college courses that can be applied to post-secondary education. The section Early College Specialist provides oversight for implementation and compliance of the program.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code: 53A-17a-120, 53A-15-101 ,53A-1-401, 53A-1-402. Implementation is governed by Board Rule R 277-713

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The Concurrent Enrollment Program implementation is accomplished through the following functions by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Collect and report participating student data
- Prepare and implement policy and procedures to ensure compliance with 53A-17a-120, 53A-15-101 ,53A-1-401, 53A-1-402, and Board Rule R 277-713
- Monitor LEA compliance
- Ensure that all educators working with students are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Provide technical assistance to LEAs
- Act as liaison with the Utah System of Higher Education
- Ensure completion of performance reports
- Oversee professional development for Concurrent Enrollment Coordinators
- Monitor use of funds
- Calculate and distribute funding
- Review and approve new concurrent enrollment courses
- Verify college credits earned by public education students
- Maintain the master list of courses approved for Concurrent Enrollment

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to provide any reports or information to the legislature upon request.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The Concurrent Enrollment Program benefits secondary students, their parents and the public at large.

The two performance measures are:

- The number of students participating in the Concurrent Enrollment Program.
- The number of students earning post-secondary credit.

**Summary of effectiveness and progress :**

Five year history of performance measure data, including target accomplishments:

Year	# of students	# earned credits
12-13	27,444	189,417
11-12	27,012	189,387
10-11	26,170	185,881
09-10	28,185	194,614
08-09	27,444	188,221
07-08	28,277	191,564

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

- |                         |             |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| • State Education Funds | \$8,599,164 |
| • Federal Funds         | \$0         |
| • Other (Describe)      |             |
| • Total Funding         | \$8,599,164 |

**Section Costs:**

- |                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| • Personnel Costs | \$65,149           |
| • Travel Expenses | \$1,581            |
| • Current Expense | \$ 1,234           |
| • Program         | <u>\$8,531,200</u> |
| • Total           | \$8,599,164        |

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Failure of the section to provide the above services would result in the USOE being noncompliant with Utah Legislative direction, and the inability of LEAs to implement the program. The Concurrent Enrollment Program oversight, implementation and verification of earn credits requires the efforts of a qualified staff member working in concert with the Utah System of Higher Education and LEAs. The loss of the program would impact student’s post-secondary aspirations and college completion rates in the state.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

67 Utah LEAs receive significant cost savings from the work of the Teaching and Learning section and

Services associated with the Concurrent Enrollment Program, including:

- Technical Assistance (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Planning and coordination of the Concurrent Enrollment Program (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Monitoring ( \$10,000 per LEA)

- Verification of earned credit with USHE ( \$10,000)
- Professional Development for CE Coordinators (\$10,000)

These amounts are estimated based upon the current costs and the current economy of scale.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

LEAs are able to avoid individual program cost amounting to \$50,000 each or 67 times \$50,000 which equals \$3,350,000. The work of the section ensures integrity to the purpose and implementation of the legislative funding at minimal financial cost.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

\$50,000 per LEA or \$3,350,000 statewide.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

USOE received \$8,599,164 for implementation of the Concurrent Enrollment Program. The work of this section allows LEAs to focus on teaching the courses and ensuring success for the students, rather than using their finite resources for program requirements. This has allowed USOE to help build an effective and exemplary Concurrent Enrollment Program for secondary students. The section is diligent and efficient at working with LEAs and USHE Institutions to ensure student success and build student aspirations for post-secondary education.

***Overall Benefits related to program implementation:***

- Increased numbers of students enter post-secondary institutions
- Increased academic achievement
- Increased college readiness skills
- Cost savings to families
- Increased teacher content knowledge
- Promoting high expectations for students
- Creating a college going culture in high school
- Increased college knowledge for both students and parents

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Career and Technical Education**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

**Functions**

The Career and Technical Education section provides leadership, service and accountability for programs that prepare learners for life, work and careers. Career and technical education (CTE) provides students with rigorous and coherent content that includes: (1) technical skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in careers, (2) workplace basics necessary for success in any occupation or career (such as communication skills, problem-solving, teamwork, the ability to use technology, and the ability to find and use information), and (3) real-world contexts in which academic skills can be made more relevant to students. CTE is a critical component of the total education and workforce development system in Utah. CTE is essential to the state's ability to prepare and sustain a skilled workforce and compete in a global economy.

The purpose of Career and Technical Education (CTE) is to ensure that every student has the opportunity to explore career areas that will equip him or her with the academic knowledge, technical and employment skills vital for entry into the evolving workforce of the 21st century. CTE is an essential component of the total educational system in Utah and is critical to the state's ability to compete in a global economy. Career and Technical Education activities include:

- Introduce students to career options
- Assist in development of career goals
- Provide technical skills
- Provide occupation-specific skills
- Prepare students for further education and training
- Create Pathways to success for every secondary student by providing him or her with the technical skills and academic knowledge needed to prepare for future employment and/or a successful transition to post-secondary education
- Provide students with technical training to prepare for a successful career. The structured training each student receives gives them the tools needed to be successful in a career after high school and/or further his or her post-secondary education, whether technical school, two-year college, or four-year college. Each student is encouraged to explore various CTE Pathways and to develop the essential skills to enter today's competitive job market with confidence
- Provide courses and pathways consistent with industry standards. Exploratory courses begin in the seventh grade, and subsequent courses teach students specific job readiness and job skills, which can lead to employment and post-secondary education

The Career and Technical Education state staff provide leadership, service and accountability to ensure quality programs. Functions of the section include:

- Oversee the administer \$12 million federal Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act
- Oversee the administration of state CTE funding to districts
- Leadership and management of the CTE programs
- Compliance with state law, federal law and Utah State Board policy
- Work with Utah State Board of Education, legislators, and state agencies
- Establish standards in collaboration with the Department of Workforce Services, business and industry, post-secondary institutions, and the Office of Economic Development
- Provide professional development to 2,500 CTE teachers annually
- Provide leadership and technical assistance to 40 school districts, 109 high schools, 142 middle/junior high schools, and charter schools.
- Conduct bi-monthly meetings with the CTE district and higher education directors
- Conduct monthly meetings with the CTE consortium
- Oversee coordinators, specialists, and support staff
- Establish policy and standards for programs
- Develop curriculum resources
- Provide reports to the legislature regarding secondary CTE
- Web pages maintained for LEAs
- Provide information resources to high school students, parents, and counselors
- CTE Directors information and web page information
- Assist educators in obtaining CTE secondary teaching licenses and CTE endorsements.
- Establish and maintain High School to College and Career Pathways with post-secondary institutions linking high school programs to post-secondary programs culminating in certificates or degrees
- Coordinate the CTE Student Organizations
- Management of the federal provisions of Civil Rights for Carl D. Perkins Federal Vocational Act
- Sserve as liaisons to state and national professional organizations and university programs
- Aassist with teacher preparation
- Manage teacher licensure and endorsements in CTE areas
- Provide ability for students to earn certifications

CTE Pathways include the following four key elements:

1. **Content and Standards – This allows students to...**
  - a. Recognize connections between academic and technical content
  - b. Demonstrate mastery of academic and technical content that is aligned with industry standards
  - c. Build confidence to compete for high skill, high wage, high demand occupations
  - d. Apply learning through authentic experiences
  
2. **Alignment and Articulation - This allows students to...**
  - a. Never need to take a remedial course
  - b. Continually progress in knowledge and skills when ready
  - c. Earn high school or college credit based on performance
  - d. Make the connection between educational preparation and entry into a career

3. **Accountability and Assessment - *This allows students to...***
  - a. Monitor their own progress through their demonstration of attaining standards
  - b. Demonstrate their technical and academic proficiency in meaningful ways
  - c. Adapt their program to meet their personal goals based on industry requirements
  
4. **Student Support Services - *This allows students to...***
  - a. Identify the career path options they can follow to a chosen career
  - b. Receive reliable information about careers and possible financial options for postsecondary education
  - c. Take ownership of their education through maintaining a current education plan and/or portfolio

#### **Programs**

- Agricultural Education: *Encompasses agricultural business and management, agricultural engineering, animal science, and horticulture.*
- Business Education: *Encompasses accounting, administrative procedures/office support positions, banking and finance, business computer technology, communications, and Web page design.*
- Family and Consumer Sciences Education: *Encompasses child development/child care, food and nutrition, food services/ culinary arts, hospitality, interior design, and fashion design.*
- Health Science Education: *Encompasses biotechnology, dental assisting, emergency medical technician, medical assisting, nurse assisting, and pharmacy technician.*
- Information Technology Education: *Encompasses database development, digital media, network design, programming and software engineering, technical support, and Web development.*
- Marketing Education: *Encompasses advertising and promotion, e-commerce marketing, fashion merchandising, sports and entertainment marketing, and travel and tourism.*
- Skilled and Technical Sciences Education: *Encompasses a wide range of trades including auto mechanics, carpentry, commercial art and photography, commercial aviation, cosmetology and barbering, drafting, fire science, law enforcement, and welding.*
- Technology and Engineering Education: *Encompasses materials, processes, and technologies used in manufacturing, construction, transportation, communication, and engineering-related technologies.*
- CTE Introduction Program: *provides junior high students with the direction, decision making, and planning needed in order to select their career path. Self-knowledge, Education and occupation exploration, and career planning are integrated through the curriculum.*
- Skill Certificate Program: *provides skill certificates in courses and programs in grades 9-12. The Skill Certificate exams verify skill attainment and, where available, industry exams are offered. This accountability system assures that all courses and programs in the state are consistently teaching to the standards established by experts in that occupational area.*
- Work-based Learning: *provides students opportunities to see how classroom instruction connects to the world of work and future career opportunities through internships/apprenticeships, job shadowing, career fairs/guest speakers, field studies and clinical work experiences.*
- Career and Technical Student Organizations (CTSOs): *provide a unique program of career and leadership development, motivation and recognition exclusively for middle/junior high and secondary students enrolled in career and technical education programs. CTSOs develop and expand occupational competencies related to a particular career and technical subject*

*matter and help students gain leadership skills making them more employable, preparing them to become productive citizens, and assisting them in assuming positive roles in the home and community.*

### **Statutory Provisions Fulfilled**

- Federal Carl Perkins Act requires administration of the funds for both secondary and higher education
- State law requires administration and approval of Career and Technical Education funding to LEAs including summer agriculture
- State Code 53A Chapter 1 Administration of Public Education at the State Level

[Criteria WPU for CTE](#)

[CTE Alternatives](#)

[WPU for State Set A Side](#)

Utah State Board of Education Rules

[R277-911. Secondary Career and Technical Education.](#) (Download the [RTF File](#))

[R277-914. Applied Technology Education \(ATE\) Leadership.](#) (Download the [RTF File](#))

[R277-915. Work-based Learning Programs for Interns.](#) (Download the [RTF File](#))

[R277-916. Technology, Life, and Careers, and Work-Based Learning Programs.](#) (Download the [RTF File](#))

[R277-462. Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Program.](#) (Download the [RTF File](#))

Federal Legislation

[Public Law 109-270](#) Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education, Reauthorized August 12, 2006

### ***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Ensure career and technical education programs are in compliance with state and federal statute and policy
- Distribute federal funds to school districts, the Utah College of Applied Technology, and the Utah System of Higher Education institutions.
- Ensure quality programs through technical assistance to LEAs, UCAT and USHE.
- Development of programs in charter schools for CTE courses grades 7-12 and comprehensive guidance programming and funding
- Program monitoring for relevance, relationship to economy and rigor.
- Program and financial monitoring to ensure compliance and target accomplishment.
- Standard development and curriculum resource development with higher education and business and education
- Rigorous Pathway/Programs of Study development grades 7 through 16 through post-secondary programs with articulation and concurrent enrollment.
- Monitor and expand opportunities for students in nontraditional careers for males and females
- Reporting to the federal government data and targets and working with the grant recipients on targets and accountability measures.
- Fiscal monitoring of both state and federal adult education funds through reimbursement of qualified expenses.

- Program compliance monitoring assuring appropriate usage of state and federal funds through both desk audits and on-site program monitoring

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education uses a four-phased approach to maintaining program and performance accountability, including:

- Annual Membership Reporting
- Teacher qualifications
- Teacher/course/membership reporting
- State specialist review and approval
- On-site auditing
- Annual Self-Evaluation—Standards
  - Entered by teacher online – focus on standards
  - Summary report to USOE specialists/CTE directors
  - Used to develop in-service, technical assistance, goal setting, and program improvement
- On-Site Evaluation—Standards
  - Six-year cycle
  - Instructor self-evaluation
  - State specialist on-site evaluation
  - Feedback/improvement
    - Summary report
    - Improvement plan to address needs
    - Continuous improvement and follow-up
- Student Performance on Core Indicators
  - Academic and skill achievement (standardized tests for academic, skills tests for skills)
  - Completion (graduation)
  - Placement
  - Training for nontraditional careers

Evaluation and performance improvements that are data-driven, using targets, performance results, performance gaps, and continuous improvement plan. The section also provides extensive financial monitoring.

Reports are sent to the U.S. Department of Education annually regarding accountability measures of placement, completion, concentration, enrollment, etc of secondary and post-secondary programs.

Data is sent to USOE from the post-secondary institutions and LEAs regarding performance measures. The data is used to work with the local recipients on a continuous improvement plan.

Skill Certification exams are given to high school students at the end of each semester or end of course. Exams are given on line and data is given to students, teachers, school, district and state. Data provide information for teacher to improve their instruction and outcomes.

OCR site reviews are conducted through the section through provisions of the Federal Carl Perkins Education act. Reports are provide the institutions and provided the Federal Government.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

- Student preparation for careers and college work
- Accountability across the state in all LEAs
- Consistency of program standards implemented and maintained statewide
- Technical assistance as requested/required
- Maintenance of regulatory compliance
- Professional development available to all programs based on program needs and monitoring findings
- State collection and reporting of program data and outcomes
- Consistent standards aligned with needs of business and industry, post-secondary education and workforce projections.
- Unnecessary duplication of programs

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

State Education Funds MSP	\$ 1,918,700
Federal Funds (estimate)	11,421,833
State Funding Pass Through	9,538,167
Other (On line Testing CTE, flow through):	341,000
<b>Total Funding</b>	<hr/> <b>\$ 23,219,700</b>

**Section Costs:**

Personnel Costs	\$ 2,382,254
Travel Expenses	\$ 69,043
Current Expenses	\$ 468,756
Other Charges	\$ 606,822
<b>Total Costs</b>	<hr/> <b>\$ 3,526,875</b>

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- Loss of program accountability, relevance and rigor
- Potential for discrimination
- Loss of regulatory function and federal Perkins funds
- Loss of ability to meet Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for potentially awarded federal funds
- Loss of program continuity and ability for programs to best meet the needs of the state
- Loss of centralized accountability measures and data

- Potential for program funding inequities
- Potential for economic loss because Utah citizens will not be prepared for employment, post-secondary education and to meet the demands of business and industry

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- Non-duplicated services in CTE courses and pathways
- LEAs are not providing courses and programs that do not align in a CTE Pathway that leads to career and college.
- Consistency of all programs assuring that student needs and industry standards are met without wasted funding on programs not aligned to needs of post secondary education programs and needs of the workforce.
- When students are unprepared at high school graduation to enter the workforce or to enter post-secondary education they will be entering unprepared to earn a living wage creating situations where Utah citizens may require more public assistance and students may access post-secondary training which is another cost to tax payers and to the individual student.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- State less likely to meet Utah's Goal of having 66% of Utah's population with a post-secondary degree or certificated.
- Economic loss because of a poorly training workforce in high demand CTE occupations
- Loss in federal funds.
- Not in compliance with state and federal statutes.
- School districts unable to keep pace with changes in technology and needs of business and industry.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

- Forty one school districts and charter schools providing professional development for 2,500 teachers annually with staffing and programing at \$4 million annually.
- Loss of Federal funding for higher education, UCAT and public education \$12 million annually.
- Forty one school districts and charter schools establishing individual linkages with business and industry and Department of Workforce Services to establish and maintain CTE standards \$2 million annually.
- The Department of Workforce Services establishing staffing to meet the needs of 41 school districts individually \$2 million annually.
- The Utah College of Applied Technology and the Utah System of Higher Education additional staffing costs to meet the coordination and articulation needs with school districts would be 10 FTE at \$1.5 million annually.
- Forty one school districts and charter schools creating their own accountability system for industry certification would cost \$5 million annually.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Career and technical education programs provide skills for students to directly enter the workforce or articulate in a CTE Pathway into post-secondary education. One of the missions of CTE is to give students the skills they need to be in a productive career which has tremendous economic benefits to the state and to individual Utah citizens. The leadership, accountability and service the CTE section provides to meet these goal provide a coordinated, non-duplicated system with LEAs not needed to use their resources to coordinate professional development, establish standards, provide accountability measures and ensure quality.

Benefit/Cost: 8.15

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Data and Statistics**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Data and Statistics define, collect, review, analyze and report a variety of data on individual students, teachers and schools statewide including their demographics, enrollment, test scores, achievement and many other data items within, and as required by, Utah State law, Board Rule, Federal law, and national mandate. The Section collaborates with Utah State Office of Education (USOE), Local Education Agency (LEA), private entities, Legislative, and Governor's stakeholders to address issues of quality education data in a secure and changing environment. The data are used to regularly inform the public and decision makers throughout the system, and are used to distribute over \$4.5 billion in state and federal funds.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

53A-17a-101 et seq. State Board of Education to administer the Minimum School Program

53A-13-202 Driver Education

53A-17a-106 and R277-419 Establish standards for student membership data that is the basis for determining WPUs in the Minimum School Program

53A-17a-107 and R277-486 Professional Staff Cost

53A-17a-109 and R277-445 Necessarily Existent Small Schools Program

53A-17a-153 and R277-110 Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment

53A-17a-135 and R277-459 Classroom Supplies and Materials appropriation

R277-484 Enforce timelines for data submission

Public Law 112-74 Title I, Parts A Education Finance Incentive Grants and C Migrant Education, Programs Neglected and Delinquent, Per Pupil Expenditure and the McKinney-Vento Homeless programs

51-2a-201 and 53A-19 Receive LEA financial statements

53A-15-1210 Direct Providers to administer state-designated assessments consistent with R277-404 and R277-473 for online courses using Local Education Agency (LEA) adopted and state-approved assessments

53A-15-1213 Online courses

53A-15-1209 Establish and administer pupil membership rules

Data and Statistic performs data audits to improve data quality for the following:

- Class size averages, including secondary courses
- Graduation rate calculation
- Dropout/transfer codes

- Limited English Proficient (LEP) students not assessed on the Utah Academic Language Proficiency Assessment (UALPA)
- Participation codes used on CRT assessments
- Schools included in school directory
- Membership
- UTREx data submissions
- Schools' Utah Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS)
- Addresses in CACTUS
- Directed Writing Assessment(DWA)
- ED Facts congruency analyses
- Title III Immigrant counts
- Teacher Salary data
- Data submitted in Federal reports
- Race/Ethnicity data reported according to the new Federal guidelines
- Students identified as full academic year
- USOE Data Display
- Data Gateway
- Attendance data
- Consolidated Student Profile Reports (CSPR)
- Researcher Datasets
- Development of Utah Data Alliance (UDA)

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Data are used in final reports to:

- 53A-1-301 Superintendent's Annual Report, statistical and financial data
- Utah Department of Health, Immunization Status Report
- Part B of Title VI of ESEA, US Department of Education, Data for Federal Eligibility determination of Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) grant awards
- Coordination of the EDFacts report, including Fall Enrollment and other information by LEA
- Public Law 112-74 Title I, Parts A Education Finance Incentive Grants and C Migrant Education, Programs Neglected and Delinquent, Per Pupil Expenditure and the McKinney-Vento Homeless programs
- US Census Bureau School District Review Program, school district boundaries changes
- US Department of Education, ESEA allocation updates
- National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, Federal Code Title 13-Section182, preparation and submission of the National Public Education Financial Survey
- US Census Bureau annual financial report
- EduJobs
- Federal Funding Accountability Act
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Including, but not limited to:

- Achievement Gap Report
- State Accountability including UCAS and School Grades
- Class Size
- Staff Ratios
- Graduation and Dropout
- Student Enrollment
- Student Membership
- Enrollment Projections by District and Charter School
- Advance Placement (AP) Summary
- American College Test (ACT)
- Direct Writing Assessment (DWA)
- Reading on Grade Level
- State Literacy Report
- PK – 20 Student Longitude Data System research
- Language Arts proficiency
- Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT)
- State Core Summative Assessment reports
- Utah Alternative Assessment
- UALPA
- Optional Extended Kindergarten
- College Readiness of Utah Students
- Senior Year Mathematics

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

All of the education data, millions of data bits by student, staff and location as required by state and federal law, and Board Rule are collected, verified, reviewed, analyzed, formatted, reported by experienced and well-educated staff, including but not limited to:

- Class size averages, including secondary courses
- Graduation rate calculation
- Dropout/transfer codes
- Limited English Proficient (LEP) students not assessed on the Utah Academic Language Proficiency Assessment (UALPA)
- Participation codes used on CRT assessments
- Schools included in school directory
- Student Membership, Attendance and Enrollment
- UTREx data submissions
- Schools' Utah Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS)
- School and district addresses in CACTUS
- Directed Writing Assessment(DWA)
- ED Facts congruency analyses
- Title III Immigrant counts
- Teacher Salary data

- Data submitted in Federal reports
- Race/Ethnicity data reported according to the new Federal guidelines
- Students identified as full academic year
- USOE Data Display, a variety of reports available electronically and in hard copy
- Public School Data (PSD) Gateway
- Consolidated Student Profile Reports (CSPR)
- Researcher Datasets
- Development of Utah Data Alliance (UDA)

Staff works with state and local public and private stakeholders to coordinate issues regarding data, define data elements, collection tools, timing, and enforce LEA penalties if needed.

LEA staff members are trained twice annually and as needed at a variety of Data, UASBO and Charter School conferences.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 435,300
• Federal Funds	\$ 36,921
• Other (Describe):	\$ 0
Total Funding	\$ 472,221

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 357,200
• Travel Expenses	\$ 1,329
• Current Expenses	\$ 30,200
• Other Charges	\$ 83,492
Total Costs	\$ 472,221

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- The public education system would be out of compliance with a variety of state and federal laws, State Board Rules, and financial sanctions would result
- Over \$4.5 billion in state and federal funds would lack basis for distribution
- Statistical and financial data would be unavailable
- Without the distribution of funds, schools could not operate

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

LEAs receive statistical assistance and training for which they would otherwise have to pay an estimated

\$10.8 million. Each LEA would need to hire at least a .75 FTE highly-skilled data and statistics professional that commands approximately \$60.00 an hour wage plus benefits, or \$123,000 per LEA. Economies of scale are experienced by the collection, analysis and reporting of LEA data at one location, by a few with high degrees of technical expertise and experience.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Without data rules, procedures and reviews, errors would be rampant, and data inconsistent across LEAs.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

If these functions were to be privatized, an estimated contract expense would be \$1.2 million for a firm with less knowledgeable personnel.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The work of this section fulfills the need of federal, state and local decision makers to have accurate and uniformed data in a timely manner. This allows LEAs to focus on their primary function of educating students, rather than using their finite resources for administrative data responsibilities. This has allowed the USOE to build an effective and proactive general system of monitoring, auditing, and reporting data.

The section operates with ultimate efficiency. It has an ongoing contact with all LEAs, allowing for proactive management, and frequent and timely responses to LEA needs for technical assistance.

Total Benefits: \$493,164 - \$1,200,000

Total Costs: \$472,221

Benefit/Cost: 1.08-2.5



**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching & Learning**

**Program: Dual Language Immersion, World Languages and Foreign Exchange Students**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

**Dual Language Immersion**

The Foreign Language Specialist in the section of Teaching and Learning oversees programs and functions related to Dual Language Immersion as outlined in Utah Code 53A-15-105, State Board Rule 277-488, and United States Department of Defense (Startalk grants for teachers and students). In addition, this program entails working with teachers to ensure they are highly qualified to serve students through appropriate endorsements as outlined in Utah Code 53A-6 and Board rule 277-502.

Who is served? 23 LEAs, teachers, students

How many served last school year? 156 schools, 468 teachers, approximately 15,500 students

How supported?

The USOE World Language & Dual Immersion Specialist closely monitors all schools and meets regularly with school principals and district administrators. USOE provides state-level leadership for the rapidly increasing number of Dual Immersion programs in Utah schools in the research, planning, professional development and curriculum development phases. For example, the USOE has: (1) developed a generic model language and literacy framework that is aligned to the Utah Core Curriculum; (2) developed language-specific versions of that framework in Chinese, French, and Spanish; (3) developed materials to enable the teaching of other content areas, *e.g.* math, science, art, health and social studies, in Chinese, French, and Spanish so half of the school day can be taught in those languages while still enabling children to meet state standards in all content areas; (4) developed a model for the preparation and on-going support of Dual Immersion teachers, instructional leaders, and principals.

In addition, the USOE World Language & Dual Immersion Specialist closely monitors all schools and meets regularly with school principals and district administrators. USOE provides state-level leadership for the rapidly increasing number of Critical Language programs in Utah schools.

Finally, the USOE World Language and Dual Immersion Specialist closely monitors two Startalk grants annually awarded to the USOE from the National Security Agency (US Defense Department) for Chinese Dual Immersion students and teachers. The USOE Specialist also serves as an advisor and presenter for the four Startalk grants awarded annually to Brigham Young University from the National Security Agency for secondary Chinese and Arabic teachers, and secondary Chinese and Arabic students.

### **World Languages**

Who is served? LEAs, teachers, students

How many served last school year? 84 LEAs, 807 teachers, 104,812 students

How supported?

The Utah State Office of Education provides high-quality World Language programs in 12 different languages that implement the Utah Core Standards in World Languages and serves the needs of the students of Utah. The World Languages Specialist is an indispensable part of a quality language program. The World Languages Specialist promotes high expectations for all students; supports a positive caring climate for learning in an orderly, purposeful environment; communicates with LEAs and the community; works as a member of the USOE team to carry out the State School Board's mission; and sets and carries out goals for personal professional development.

### **Foreign Exchange Program:**

State Statute (funding and Board responsibilities) 53A-2-206, State Board Rule 277-612

State funding for J-1 foreign exchange students is limited to a total of 328 students. The quota or allocation of J-1 foreign exchange students per public school district/charter is set by the USOE no later than April 1. Public school districts/charters will be reimbursed the equivalent of the current year's value of the *Weighted Pupil Unit* for each foreign exchange student. Verification of the J-1 foreign exchange student will be based on the October 1 Report and funding will be based on the End of Year Report.

### **World Language endorsement:**

53A-6 (section in code regarding licensure and endorsements)

Board rules R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520

### **Dual Language Immersion endorsement:**

53A-6 (section in code regarding licensure and endorsements)

Board rules R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520

### ***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The specialist:

- Develops an appropriate budget, seeks additional funding, and manages grants to bring innovative programs, courses, and techniques to the State of Utah.
- Provides leadership in the ongoing and implementation of World Languages programs that

meets the needs of all students as well as the critical language needs of the United States.

- Supports and monitors work of teachers acquiring language endorsements as required in Utah Code 53A-6.
- Provides professional development for instructional improvement based on current research, trends in language teaching, and LEA needs.
- Serves as a liaison with appropriate district, state, national and international agencies and universities.
- Serves as a source of specialized information on second language acquisition.
- Serves as a consultant on World Language issues for the Utah State Office of Education, State School Board, State Legislature, and Governor's Office.
- Stays knowledgeable about the development of learning materials by publishers and others, as well as supervising the approval of appropriate textbooks, ancillary materials, and technology on the State approved instructional materials list.
- Provides leadership in developing and carrying out statewide co-curricular and extracurricular for World Languages activities for students.
- Serves as a resource on effective language instruction, national issues, and related legislation for all USOE staff and the community.
- Stays abreast of trends and issues in language education and brings innovation and renewal to instruction.
- Collaborates with district administrators and teachers to promote instructional consistency and a shared direction with colleagues in other content areas on interdisciplinary curriculum and professional development.
- Stays actively involved in national language organizations and provide up-to-date knowledge to the state.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Legislative Report on the Critical Language/Dual Immersion Program which is a Legislative Initiative 53A-15-105
- Legislative Report on the Critical Language Program which is a Legislative Initiative 53A-15-105
- Legislative Report on the J-1 Foreign Exchange Student Program as required by the Legislature 53A-2-206
- Federal Report on Critical Language Programs to the National Security Agency as part of the Startalk grants for Chinese and Portuguese
- Federal Report on K-12 Chinese Language Programs to the US Defense Department as part the Language Flagship grant with Brigham Young University

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

**Dual Language Immersion and Critical Language Program:**

In a rapidly expanding global society and marketplace, Utah is implementing research-based language initiatives, *Critical Languages & Dual Immersion*, which meets the demands of academic rigor and global competency in the 21st Century. Utah's governmental representatives, educational leaders and parents

are turning to *Dual Immersion* programs to enhance the future economic development of Utah! Empirical research over the past forty years has substantiated the efficiency and effectiveness of immersion programs. The program is designed to prepare Utah's next generation for the competitive world workforce.

Dual immersion programs offer students the opportunity to become proficient in a second language while attaining high levels of academic achievement. In addition to the academic, linguistic and cultural benefits, immersion students consistently demonstrate enhanced critical thinking and cognitive skills. In the words of Sen. Howard Stephenson, "in this increasingly competitive world, it is critical for Utah students to be able to deliver services and information in various languages and appreciate the subtleties of doing business in other cultures, much of which is learned through foreign language study."

### ***Student Outputs and Participating LEA Outputs***

**Performance Measure 1:** Utah students in Dual Immersion programs will reach age-appropriate levels of proficiency in the languages they are studying, and will meet all core content-area standards as required by Utah State law.

*Measure 1.1* The Utah model for K-12 Dual Immersion program is a statewide model of a well-articulated sequence of language study that reflects current research in foreign language education; provides an uninterrupted pathway for students to meet the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning; and prepares

*Measure 1.2* The immersion programs uses performance assessments to measure learning, inform instruction and improve student proficiency in the target languages in a constant loop of assessment, feedback, and adjustment.

*Measure 1.3* The Utah K-12 Dual Immersion program prepares students to reach the Advanced level of proficiency in the targeted languages by grade 12.

*Measure 1.4* The Utah K-12 Dual Immersion program prepares students to meet all content area standards required by state law.

**Performance Measure 2:** Program teachers will be well prepared to teach in a standards-based immersion program that reflects best practices and current research in second language acquisition.

*Measure 2.1* Teachers are knowledgeable about and skillful in teaching, assessment, and instructional planning through an on-going, job-embedded professional development program.

**Performance Method 3:** The project will collaborate and share with the profession nationally its activities and products during the 3-year FLAP period and beyond.

*Measure 3.1* The project shares in the state and nation the results and products of the project, including the generic and the language-specific literacy frameworks and curricula as well as the principles and processes developed for immersion programs.

*Measure 3.2* Project staff collaborates with institutions of higher education and other districts and states working to develop and evaluate frameworks and curricula in the target languages.

**Utah University K-16 Partners:** Brigham Young University, University of Utah, Utah State University, Utah Valley University and Weber State University.

**Five year history of performance measure data, including target accomplishments:**

**Professional Development Highlights (teachers)**

2007-08: Startalk Secondary Chinese (BYU) – 18 teachers

Startalk Secondary Arabic (BYU) – 4 teachers

Chinese EdNet facilitators (UEN) – 12 teachers

Dual Immersion Training – 62 administrators

2008-09: Startalk Chinese Dual Immersion Training – 18 teachers

Startalk Secondary Chinese (BYU) – 14 teachers

Startalk Secondary Arabic (BYU) – 6 teachers

Ongoing Dual Immersion PD – 64 teacher

Annual Utah Dual Immersion Institute – 197 teachers and administrators

2009-10: Startalk Chinese Dual Immersion Training – 44 teachers and aides

Startalk Secondary Chinese (BYU) – 22 teachers

Startalk Secondary Arabic (BYU) – 7 teachers

Ongoing Dual Immersion PD – 122 teacher

Annual Utah Dual Immersion Institute – 268 teachers and administrators

Utah Dual Immersion Advisory Council – 52 district administrators and principals

2010-11: Startalk Chinese Dual Immersion Training – 72 teachers and aides

Startalk Secondary Chinese (BYU) – 13 teachers

Startalk Secondary Arabic (BYU) – 5 teachers

Ongoing Dual Immersion PD – 241 teacher

Annual Utah Dual Immersion Institute – 375 teachers and administrators

Utah Dual Immersion Advisory Council – 91 district administrators and principals

2011-12: Startalk Chinese Dual Immersion Training – 82 teachers and aides

Startalk Portuguese Immersion Training – 22 teachers and aides

Startalk Secondary Chinese (BYU) – 13 teachers

Startalk Secondary Arabic (BYU) – 5 teachers

Ongoing Dual Immersion PD – 241 teacher

Annual Utah Dual Immersion Institute – 555 teachers and administrators

Utah Dual Immersion Advisory Council – 123 district administrators and principals

**Startalk Summer Camp Highlights (students)**

2007-08: Startalk Secondary Chinese – 22 students

Startalk Secondary Arabic Students – 16

2008-09: Startalk Chinese Dual Immersion – 411 students

Startalk Secondary Chinese – 44 students

Startalk Secondary Arabic Students – 20

2009-10: Startalk Chinese DLI – 1150 students

Startalk Secondary Chinese – 72 students

Startalk Secondary Arabic Students – 19

2010-11: Startalk Chinese DLI – 1945 students

Startalk Secondary Chinese – 80 students

Startalk Secondary Arabic Students – 24

2011-12: Startalk Chinese DLI – 1115 students

Startalk Portuguese DLI – 102 students

Startalk Secondary Chinese – 80 students

Startalk Secondary Arabic Students – 24

## **World Languages**

### **Curriculum design and implementation**

- Provides leadership in the ongoing design and implementation of a variety of World Language programs and courses that meet the needs of all students as well as the critical language needs of the community, state, and nation.
- Provides leadership in selecting course goals, objectives, and teaching and assessment activities that foster success for students with differing learning styles, abilities and interests.
- Provides leadership in the continuous development, distribution and implementation of curriculum guides for each language course.
- Promotes instructional strategies that lead to real language proficiency in culturally authentic situations.
- Systematically and continuously monitors instructional processes to ensure that language class activities are related to desired program outcomes.
- Works with LEAs to ensure that curriculum accountability and revision are continuous and responsive to student needs.
- Gathers and compiles assessment and other data for use in program improvement.
- Makes suggestions for updating language programs to include the latest technology, such as multimedia and telecommunications.
- Promotes collaboration with other departments to integrate language study with other curricula.
- Confers with LEA administrators to interpret assessment data, instructional procedures, and student progress along with teacher effectiveness.
- Facilitates articulation between levels.

### **Professional Development and Educator Quality**

- Provides professional development and instructional improvement activities based on current research, trends in World Languages teaching, and LEA needs.
- Assists in improving the World Languages through leadership of the State World Languages Coordinators' Committee comprised of LEA and university representatives.
- Provides and communicates opportunities for professional growth through state university partners.
- Oversees the World Language endorsement and the SAEP program.
- Participates, as appropriate, in teacher recruitment and placement of International Guest

## Teachers in Utah Schools

### **Teaching materials approval**

- Supervises the statewide adoption of textbooks and ancillary materials for each course on the State approved list.
- Researches and recommends appropriate materials, supplies, and technology pertinent to each language program.
- Disseminates instructional resources to support LEAs in accomplishing instructional goals

### **Statewide activities**

- Provides leadership in developing and carrying out statewide World Languages curricular and extracurricular activities for students.
- Information and advocacy
- Communicates regularly with LEA personnel about local and state requirements concerning World Languages education as well as providing updates on national issues and legislation affecting language programs.
- Serves as a liaison among LEAs, universities, the USOE, and the community.
- Articulates the language program goals and objectives to parents and community leaders and solicits their support in realizing program goals and objectives.
- Serves as a resource on effective language instruction to all LEAs and the community.

### **Responsibility for Leadership**

- If the various parts of a World Languages supervisor's job form the woof of the job's fabric, then the responsibility for leadership forms the warp. These characteristics are found throughout the effective supervisor's work.
- Innovator and creator of new programs for early language learning, for example, Dual Immersion.
- Stays abreast of trends and issues in World Languages education.
- Brings innovation and renewal to instruction.
- Designs and implements new programs, courses, and activities to meet student and societal needs.
- Seeks innovations in delivery of instruction and brings to the LEAs knowledge of effective materials, methods, and strategies that encourage successful learning for all students.
- Stays knowledgeable about the development of learning materials by publishers and colleagues in other schools.

### **Collaborator with other curriculum areas and departments**

- Works with colleagues in other departments on interdisciplinary projects, curriculum and professional development.
- Assists with programs, such as at risk programs, which provide services to language minority students.
- Collaborates with LEAs, universities and teachers to promote instructional consistency and a

shared direction.

#### **Project manager of grants and other extramural programs**

- Seeks outside funding for World Languages program improvement.
- Manages procured grants to bring innovative courses and instructional techniques to the state and LEAs.

#### **Liaison with appropriate national and international agencies and with universities**

- Represents the state in its relations with federal and international agencies concerning World Languages education.
- Brings to the state needed information such as regulations, standards, accountability, and available help.
- Cooperates with college and university staff to optimize articulation.

#### **Spokesperson for the State**

- Explains the State's World Languages program to parents, news media, governmental officials and community leaders.

#### **Spokesperson for the language discipline**

- Serves as a source of specialized information on World Languages teaching and learning for the USOE, State School Board members, and the community.
- Speaks at conferences and meetings and serves on local, regional, and national committees and task forces.

The overarching intent of world language instruction in secondary levels 1 – 6 is to educate students linguistically and culturally to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which all students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other world language. The purposes and uses of world languages are as diverse as the students who study them. Some students study another language in hopes of finding a rewarding career in the international marketplace or government service. Others are interested in the intellectual challenge and cognitive benefits that accrue to those who develop competency in multiple languages. Still other students seek greater understanding of other peoples and cultures. Many learners approach world language study, as they do other courses, simply to fulfill a requirement. Regardless of the reason for study, world languages have something to offer everyone.

World language instruction in Utah secondary schools is implemented as a sequence of levels I - VI. The *levels* of language instruction are based on the content of the curriculum and the time involved in the instruction. Because the implementation of world language programs varies greatly from one context to another and entry into a world language program can occur at various grades during secondary school.

Some of the Performance Measures are:

- 1. Develop competency in more than one language and culture**
  - a. Communicate with other people in other cultures in a variety of settings.
  - b. Look beyond their own customary border.
  - c. Develop insight into their own language and culture.
  - d. Act with greater awareness of self, of other cultures, and their own relationship to those cultures.
  - e. Gain direct access to additional bodies of knowledge.
  - f. Participate more fully in the global community and marketplace.
  
- 2. Demonstrate understanding of the nature of language**
  - a. Understand that language enhances and identifies human beings as meaning makers.
  - b. Understand that language is the vehicle for constructing knowledge, acquiring skills and developing habits of mind.
  - c. Understand that language captures and records human aspirations and imagination.
  - d. Understand that language is continuously evolving as a reflection of human evolution.
  - e. Understand that language acquisition is not a matter of refining skills, but of increasing confidence, insight, and discernment.
  - f. Understand that language conveys the depth of human experience, evoking both emotion and reason.
  
- 3. Understand and use oral language skills to communicate in the target language**
  - a. Give and seek information in conversations, in-group discussions and in oral presentations.
  - b. Use questioning techniques to gain information.
  - c. Participate in and report on small group learning activities.
  - d. Develop and deliver individual presentations.
  - e. Plan, present, and critique the oral delivery of information and persuasive argument.
  - f. Plan, present and critique dramatic readings of literary selections.
  
- 4. Use the skills, strategies, and processes of reading in the target language**
  - a. Develop an enjoyment for reading as a lifelong way to learn.
  - b. Access background knowledge to prepare to read and enjoy texts.
  - c. Use meta-cognition strategies during reading to monitor comprehension.
  - d. Improve comprehension by using strategies when meaning breaks down.
  - e. Retain information from and respond to text after reading.
  
- 5. Use the skills, strategies, and processes of writing in the target language**
  - a. Develop a distinctive writing voice.
  - b. Understand that writing is a process of skills, strategies, and practices for creating, revising, and editing a variety of texts.

- c. Develop reflective abilities and meta-awareness about writing.
- d. Use writing to discover and explore ideas.
- e. Develop collaborative writing skills to prepare for workplace writing.
- f. Understand that writing is a tool for thinking: solving problems, exploring issues, constructing questions, and addressing inquiry.
- g. Understand that reading and writing are interrelated: writers approach new reading experiences with enhanced appreciation for the text.
- h. Appreciate the value of personal writing and writing-to-learn in daily applications of knowledge.

**Five year history of performance measure data, including target accomplishments:**

**Student Enrollment**

2006-07: 78,878  
 2007-08: 92,194  
 2008-09: 95,535  
 2009-10: 98,209  
 2010-11: 104,812

**Professional Development Highlights (teachers)**

2007-08: Utah Foreign Language Association Conference – 302 teachers  
 FLES Project Training – 168 teachers  
 Teaching World Language Standards – 19 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (French) – 23 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (Spanish) - 24 teachers  
 BYU Spanish Teachers Workshop – 14 teachers

2008-09: Utah Foreign Language Association Conference – 315 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (French) – 19 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (Spanish) - 26 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (German) – 18 teachers  
 Methods of Teaching American Sign Language – 32 teachers  
 BYU German Film Project – 16 teachers  
 BYU Spanish Teachers Workshop - 21 teachers  
 LinguaFolio Assessment Workshop – 80 teachers  
 SWCOLT Conference – 185 teachers  
 Teaching ACTFL Standards – 76 teachers

2009-10: Utah Foreign Language Association Conference – 405 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (French) – 25 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (Spanish) - 22 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (German) – 21 teachers  
 BYU Spanish Teacher Workshop – 29 teachers  
 BYU French Teacher Workshop – 12 teachers

LinguaFolio Assessment Workshop – 68 teachers  
 Authentic Language Assessment – 76 teachers  
 Talking Up a Storm Workshops – 64 teachers  
 2010-11: Utah Foreign Language Association Conference – 453 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (French) – 18 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (Spanish) - 19 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (German) – 16 teachers  
 Improving Oral Language Production Workshop – 89 teachers  
 BYU Spanish Teacher Workshop – 38 teachers  
 BYU French Teacher Workshop – 25 teachers  
 Authentic Language Assessment – 71 teachers  
 2011-12: Utah Foreign Language Association Conference – 410 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (French) – 14 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (Spanish) - 15 teachers  
 UU Tanner Humanities Teacher Workshop (German) – 12 teachers  
 BYU Spanish Teacher Workshop – 44 teachers  
 BYU French Teacher Workshop – 22 teachers  
 Authentic Language Assessment – 158 teachers

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1,080,600</li> <li>• \$ 81,000</li> </ul>
--	--

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Program</li> </ul> <p>Total Costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$ 131,000</li> <li>• \$ 6,000</li> <li>• \$ 3,097</li> <li>• \$1,090,400 (out to LEAs)</li> </ul> <p>\$1,230,497</p>
--	--

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

States that depend on generalists to oversee their World Language (WL) and Dual Language Immersion (DLI) programs miss out on the knowledge and ability that a WL & DLI specialist offers. It is impossible to have the depth of knowledge in every content subject area that is necessary for an effective instructional program and up to date effective strategies using technology. The USOE needs a WL & DLI specialist who is knowledgeable about current research and practice in the field and who disseminates that knowledge to LEAs throughout the State of Utah. Utah would not be a recognized national leader

in WL and DLI without a specialist at the USOE.

- The Dual Language Immersion program would have neither oversight nor leadership. There would be nobody to report to the legislature on the effective implementation of the legislative funded Dual Language Immersion/Critical Languages program.
- World Languages programs would not as effectively produce career and college ready students and there would be no coordination of articulation K-12. In addition, there would be a lack of ability by the USOE to work with universities for K-16 proficiency based language learning.
- The J-1 Foreign Exchange program would be suspended. LEAs would lack a central point of coordination for foreign high school students studying in Utah. Also, there would be no oversight or management of the 328 WPU dedicated to this program by the Legislature.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Dual Language Immersion: \$900,000 LEAs would have the burden of developing curriculum and materials, providing professional development in the target language, recruiting and retaining teachers, reporting to the legislature, etc.

World Languages: \$400,000 LEAs would need to coordinate with universities, create proficiency based standards, developing formative and summative assessments in target language.

Foreign Exchange Student program: \$50,000 No administration of 328 WPU for program or coordination with LEAs for placement and regulation of students.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Dual Language Immersion: \$500,000 LEAs and SEA avoid relying on vendors and third party for developing K-6 curriculum in target language.

World Languages: \$200,000 Reliance on outside vendors for providing costly professional development and pacing guides for proficiency in licenses.

Foreign Exchange Student program: \$30,000 SEA and LEAs avoid issues with non-compliance of federal and state policies and procedures working with foreign students in the visa and placement process.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

Loss of federal grants from the US Defense Department and National Security Agency in the amount of \$460,000.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The savings to both the USOE and Utah LEAs for the combined position of the World Languages and Dual Language Immersion Specialist far outweighs the salary, expenses and compensation for this position. Dual Immersion programs would likely not exist as setting up a program is time-intensive at the LEA level and takes a great deal of support from a state specialist. LEAs would have to go through the expensive and extensive process of issuing visas for Visiting Guest Teachers and students by contracting with a third party permitted by the Federal government. The teaching of World Languages in a 21<sup>st</sup> Century competency based model requires extensive professional development and updating of materials. LEAs would incur this cost and for charters and small or rural districts, this would be a daunting financial burden.

Net Benefit: \$1,090,400

Benefit/Cost: 7.78

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Entry Years Enhancement**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Early Years Enhancement (EYE) program provides professional support for new or returning Level 1 educators as they work to advance to a Level 2 license. The program was created to assist new and returning teachers as they begin to teach. EYE includes mentoring, testing, evaluation, monitoring to ensure three years of successful and effective teaching and the development of a professional portfolio. Public benefit is obtained as educators are successfully retained as effective teachers and those who do not succeed are helped to explore other alternatives.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code Section 53A-9-103(5) which directs a program of evaluation and mentoring for beginning teachers designed to assist those beginning teachers in developing the skills required of capable teachers; Section 53A-6-102(2)(a)(iii) which finds that the implementation of progressive strategies regarding induction, professional development and evaluation are essential in creating successful teachers; Section 53A-6-106 and Board Rule R277-552.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

EYE program implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Gather information about beginning teachers and their mentors
- Prepare and implement procedures to ensure compliance with Board Rule R277-552
- Support LEAs in implementing the program
- Ensure that all EYE educators are working with a qualified mentor
- Provide Technical assistance to teachers, principals, and LEAs
- Provide general supervision of program compliance and issue resolution
- Oversee professional development to LEA EYE representatives
- Manage communication and completion of assignments
- Facilitate LEA collaboration and program development for induction activities
- Provide professional development for LEA leaders

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to provide reports and information upon request.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The Entry Years Enhancement (EYE) program serves all Level 1 Utah educators, all district and charter EYE Coordinators, all district and charter H.R. directors and their staffs, as well as all students who are in the classrooms of Level 1 teachers. Public benefit is obtained as educators are successfully retained as effective teachers and those who do not succeed are helped to explore

other alternatives.

How many served last school year?

- 12,933 Level 1 educators in all Utah districts and Charter Schools
- 92 Entry Years Enhancements district and charter school program coordinators
- 96 new EYE mentors in comprehensive EYE professional development
- 41 district Human Resources Directors
- Members of the Utah State Board of Education
- Utah State Office of Education Administrators

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$ 96,843.99
• Other (Describe):	\$
Total Funding	<hr/> \$ 96,843.99

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 65,723.52
• Travel Expenses	\$ 72.42
• Current Expenses	\$ 3,234.00
• Program Costs	\$ 27,814.05
Total Costs	<hr/> \$ 96,843.99

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Failure of the section to provide the above services would result in the USOE being noncompliant with Utah Legislative direction, the inability of LEAs to implement the program and a loss of services that benefit Utah children. EYE oversight and implementation require the efforts of a qualified staff member working in concert with teachers, mentors, principals, and LEA staff. The loss of the program would impact students and communities who are benefiting from the program which could result in reduced achievement and satisfaction.

Examples of lost benefit include

- All LEAs would be without technical assistance for implementing the EYE requirements or support to meet the needs of local programs.
- HR directors, district/charter program coordinators would be without various professional development opportunities and ongoing consultation on the licensing and development needs of beginning teachers.
- LEAs would have the burden of counseling hundreds of Level 1 EYE teachers as they progress toward upgrade to a Level 2 Utah Educator License.
- Fewer Utah educators holding a Level 1 license would upgrade to a Level 2, leading to high educator turnover rates and less effective instruction for students.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

136 LEAs receive significant cost savings from the work of the Teaching and Learning section and services associated with EYE, including:

- Technical Assistance (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Professional Development (\$10,000 per LEA)

These amounts are estimated based upon current costs and the current economy of scale.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

LEAs are able to avoid individual program costs amounting to \$20,000 each or 136 times \$20,000 which equals \$2,720,000. The work of the section ensures integrity to the purpose and implementation of the program at minimal financial cost.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

\$20,000 per LEA or \$2,720,000 statewide.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The work of this section allows LEAs to focus on working with teachers, rather than using their finite resources for program responsibilities. This has allowed USOE to help build an effective EYE program. The section is efficient and has ongoing contact with all LEAs allowing for frequent and timely responses to LEA needs.

Benefit-Cost: 27

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2013 Legislature)**

**Section: Education Equity**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

***Federally Mandated State Education Agency (SEA) K-12 Civil Rights Compliance Monitoring - Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, Title VII (EEO):***

**Education Programs and Activities Covered by Title IX**

Programs and activities which receive ED funds must operate in a nondiscriminatory manner.

([http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix\\_dis.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix_dis.html))

**SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973**

This policy interpretation applies to any public or private institution, person, or other entity that receives or benefits from HEW financial assistance. For further information, see definition of "recipient" at 45 CFR section 84.3(f).

*Authority:* Regulation issued under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 45 CFR §84.22 and appendix A.

(<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/reg/ocr/frn-1978-08-14.html>)

**PART 100—NONDISCRIMINATION UNDER PROGRAMS RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EFFECTUATION OF TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964**

A local educational agency (as defined in 20 U.S.C. 8801), system of vocational education, or other school system

**TITLE 34—EDUCATION**

**PART 100—NONDISCRIMINATION UNDER PROGRAMS RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EFFECTUATION OF TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964**

This regulation applies to any program to which Federal financial assistance is authorized to be extended to a recipient under a law administered by the Department.

(Authority: § 602, 604, Civil Rights Act of 1964; 78 Stat. 252, 253; 42 U.S.C. 2000d-1, 2000d-3)

(<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/reg/ocr/edlite-34cfr100.html#S4>)

As the unfunded federally mandated SEA, the Utah State Office of Education, is required to have staff (the Education Equity Section), to address Title VI (Race, National Origin, Sex) issues/concerns, and serve as the state Title IX Coordinator and Section 504 Monitoring Officers, who respond to all K-12 civil rights inquiries and complaints, and route them accordingly.

It is also responsible for maintaining an updated directory of similar positions required for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs), including 41 districts and charter schools, and maintain a record of updated guidance and complaint prevention training to LEA monitoring officers, administrators and teachers.

**July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013**

**Receiving, logging and routing civil rights inquires and complaints:**

Phone/Email Inquiries –	268	Total hours	1086
Formal Complaints –	11	Total hours	110
Referred to Spec. Ed. –	2	Total hours	2
General phone calls/emails	<u>1671</u>	Total hours	<u>112</u>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,952</b>		<b>3,262</b>

**Note:** The Section Civil Rights Database, for all K-12 LEAs, contains a detailed record of above information to track the inquiries/complaints process through complaint resolution and monitor trends and patterns, that is made available to the Region VIII, Office for Civil Rights (OCR), on request, and which helps prioritize the guidance technical assistance trainings for LEAs.

**Maintain and Share Most Current Civil Rights Guidance Information with LEAs**

Review all weekly hard copy and electronic guidance information, posted on agency website, and notify all LEAs of important federal guidance updates and changes.

Publications Research Time	Total hours -	373
Civil Rights Executive Summaries	Total hours -	180
Updates (see p.2 database sheet)	<u>Total hours -</u>	<u>60</u>
<b>Total</b>		<b>613</b>

**Statewide, Regional, and Local Civil Rights Guidance and Complaint Prevention Training**

**Note:** *Includes preparation and presentation facilitation time*

Statewide Guidance Trainings -	5	Total hours -	400
Regional Guidance Trainings -	6	Total hours -	165
District/School Trainings -	4	Total hours -	80
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14</b>		<b>645</b>

**All Other Equity Related Training and Projects**

***Respecting Ethnic And Cultural Heritage State Initiative***

Maintain REACH Trainings Database -	Total hours	80
REACH/Prevention Training Sessions -	Total hours	475
Update REACH TOT (Training of Trainers) Manual	Total Hours	100
Martin Luther King Essay Contest -	Total hours	255
Living Traditions Public School Day -	<u>Total hours</u>	<u>42</u>
<b>Total</b>		<b>952</b>

**Other Section Functions***Coalition of Minorities Advisory Committee Liaison Role*

CMAC Meetings	Total hours	381
USOE Meetings	Total hours	142
	<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>

Complaints:			
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-Current
Section 504	3	4	4
Title VI	3	5	1
Title IX	2	2	1

**Note:** Since January, 2009, there have been ten new Offices for Civil Right (OCR) "Dear Colleague Letters" sent to all Local Education Agencies (LEAs), which include all school districts and charter schools, throughout the country. These "Letters" constitute updated and revised civil rights requirements that impact the protected classes listed above, which schools are expected to follow. These new guidance expectations have resulted in an unprecedented rise in the number of inquiries and complaints made at the State level, by parents of students and educators in the K-12 school system, as they become more aware of their rights and responsibilities from these "Letters". For example, Section 504 inquiries/complaints, under Title II of the American Disabilities Amendment Amendments Amended Act (ADAAA), impacting students with disabilities, now include 19 new "physical or mental impairments" qualifying disabilities such as asthma, allergies, etc. This non-exhaustive list is being added to yearly, and as the education public becomes aware of them, it is anticipated that the number of inquiries and complaints to the Utah State Office of Education will increase accordingly.

Dear Colleague Letters:

- January 9, 2009, Clarification of Anti-Discrimination Laws:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-20090108.html>
- October 26, 2010, Bullying of Protected Class Students:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201010.pdf>
- April 4, 2011, Sexual Harassment Including Sexual Violence:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.pdf>
- May 6, 2011, Provide Equal Access to All Students:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201101.pdf>
- December 2, 2011, Further Diversity or Reduce Racial Isolation  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201111.pdf>
- January 25, 2013: Students with Disabilities in Extracurricular Athletics:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201301-504.pdf>
- April 24, 2013, Retaliation is Also a Violation of Federal law:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201304.html>

- June 25, 2013, Success of Pregnant and Parenting Students Under Title IX  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201306-title-ix.pdf>
- August 20, 2013, Bullying of a Student With a Disability:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/bullyingdcl-8-20-13.pdf>
- January 8, 2014, Nondiscriminatory Administration of School Discipline  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201401-title-vi.pdf>

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section**

The USOE 24-hour complaint processing time results in average of 3-6 days of missed class time for impacted protected class students “equal education opportunity” protection rights vs. average of Region VIII, OCR complaint processing time of 30 to 60 days.

Civil rights guidance and complaint prevention training and technical assistance keeps LEAs current with latest federal guidance updates which has resulted in fewer Region VIII, OCR, Utah specific LEA compliance reviews. The last protected class OCR reviews were for Title VI, National Origin (ELL student services) years, 2000-2006, and administrators and teachers better prepared to maintain federally required “safe/non-hostile learning environments for all students.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 370,000
• Federal Funds	
• Other (Describe)	
Total Funding	

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 285,630.91
• Travel Expenses	\$ 3,145.25
• Current Expenses	\$ 46,091.24
• Other Charges	\$ 35,132.60
Total Costs	\$ 370,000.00

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

There would be a dramatic increase of civil rights complaints filed directly with the Region VIII, OCR, resulting in significantly more missed classroom days for impacted protected class students , and/or their trying to function in a hostile teaching and learning school and classroom learning environment. The district/charter school administration time to investigate and resolve state level processed civil rights complaints would rise from an average of 20 total hours to an average of 60 – 80 hours, if

complaints were filed and investigated at the Region VIII, OCR level. (There are 5 states in Region VIII). Without the direct civil rights complaint prevention training for K-12 educators, administrators would be less prepared to meet their monitoring responsibilities to develop and maintain the federally required "equal education opportunity rights" for Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504 (which includes Special Education students), and for teachers to maintain non-hostile (harassment and bullying), inclusive learning environments for all students.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

LEAs, which include districts and charter schools, are able to access ***state developed civil rights complaint prevention trainings and certified trainers***, at little or no cost, resulting in direct savings from their professional development budgets.

**Total Cost Savings for complaint prevention training only:**

If these costs were privatized, it is estimated that the additional cost of 2.0 private sector FTEs would be needed. Each LEA would have to assume cost for certified trainers to train staff. These private sector trainings would, on average be \$200.00 per participant x 40 participants x 41 districts = \$328,000 + 98 charter schools x 4 participants each @ \$200.00 = \$156,880. There most likely would be travel cost as well. For an average 2 day conference, flights would be \$400.00, per diem of \$46.00 X3=\$138.00, and lodging \$130.00 x 3=\$390.00 for a total of **\$928.00**. 41 school districts X \$928.00=\$**38,048** and 98 charter schools x\$928.00= **\$90,944 Total =128,992.00**

Total

\$484,880.00 + 128,992.00= **\$613,872.00**

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

By having the federally required State Education Agency (SEA) Title VI, Non-discrimination, Title IX and Section 504 Monitoring Officers, the USOE avoids the potential loss of federal education funds, estimated to be \$462 million.

With parental option to file federal level civil rights complaints, and lawsuits, LEAs, are able to save potential in house legal counsel fees, and court costs estimated to be \$450 per hour x 42 complaints resulting in legal actions totaling \$6.3 million.

**Total Costs Avoided: \$468 million**

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

If the Section were privatized the alternative costs would be 3 FTEs x \$150 per hour totaling \$936,000.

**Total Alternative Costs: \$936,000**

Total Cost: \$370,000

Net Benefit: \$936,000 - \$468 million

Benefit divided by Cost: 2.5 to 1267 (including loss of federal funds)

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Educational Technology**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The purpose of the Educational Technology Specialist, within the Teaching and Learning section, is to provide leadership and vision to assist districts and schools in effectively leveraging technology tools and resources to improve teaching and learning. The specialist and support staff directly indirectly impacts all 41 schools districts, 86 charter schools, over 600,000 students and 70,000 school personnel. Statutory provisions include allocating and monitoring funds for online testing as outlined in 53A-1-708 and selecting and monitoring schools who have been awarded Smart School Technology grants as outlined in 53A-1-709.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

1. The Educational Technology specialist created the application and allocation tables for the distribution of funds provided as outlined in Utah Code 53A-1-708, *Grants for online testing*. This bill allocated \$7.6 million to districts and schools to acquire needed technology to deliver annual academic achievement tests to students. The work impacts all 41 districts and 86 charter schools.
2. The Educational Technology specialist fulfilled statute requirements with the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) to implement the Smart School Technology Program outlined in 53A-1-709. The Educational Technology specialist in collaboration with GOED will continue to work with the three selected schools and the awarded vendor, iSchool Campus, to ensure that this program succeeds. The specialist is also working with Southern Utah University (SUU) to implement a comprehensive evaluation on the impact of this program on teaching and learning in selected schools over the next three years as required by the law. Oversight of this program impacts over 1600 students and over 150 teachers and other personnel in the three selected schools.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Education Technology specialist is tasked with the following reports required annually by the Department of Education:

1. Internet Access Specifications: number of Internet Connected Computers to be reported. (Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) X162 Internet Access XML Specifications)
2. Federal Report on the number of teachers and students proficient with using technology
3. Approve technology plans for all 41 districts and 86 charter schools as mandated by the Federal

E-Rate Program which brings an approximate total of \$16 million annually to the state. (ESEA Title II Part D Section 2402)

4. Acquire and report key data on the progress of schools in acquiring and using technology in teaching and learning. Each year the specialist reports the number of computers, status of school networks, etc. in all of the nearly 1000 schools around the state as needed by both internal and external policymakers, including the legislature to make decisions regarding educational technology in schools.
- 5.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

Three Key Benefits:

1. Establishing Vision of and Planning for the future  
(See attached Technology Standards 2012)
2. Facilitating Collaboration and Cooperation between districts, schools and the state
3. Providing Economies of Scale

Internally the Educational Technology section assists in developing and supporting Board policy, collaboration with staff in other sections, supporting departments with updated technology tools and training, and supporting the overall mission and vision of the Board and Superintendent regarding high quality instruction.

Additionally this section provides to all education stakeholders (over 600,000 students and 70,000 employees) direction in educational technology that improves overall learning. Online coursework, infusion of digital media, and technology tools are areas of focus for the overall service provided to LEAs. USOE staff has provided leadership at a national level as well; using examples of innovation in school based technology integration as beacons for schools in the state and the nation to follow.

The Educational Technology section promotes the use of digital media, and current tools based on technology (i.e., iPods, iPads, and other devices), so that students are more engaged in curriculum and have access to more resources than ever before. Our Ed. Tech staff provides sought after professional development to districts and schools and provides support that is cutting edge.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State Education Funds</li><li>• Federal Funds</li><li>• Other (Describe):</li></ul> | \$209,702 |
|   | <hr/>     |

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Program</li> </ul>	\$ 113,502 \$ 1,800 (office expenses) \$ 94,400
Total Costs	\$ 209,702

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

Utah is noted nationally as a leader in the effective use of technology in teaching and learning. The Educational Technology specialist convenes district and school stakeholders. Districts and schools working together under the leadership of the educational technology specialist have been able to leverage the power of the community to avert duplication of effort, reduce costs for software through state cooperative contracts, and create a unified vision of how technology can improve teaching and learning. Without the guidance of this specialist, this statewide education community would be jeopardized which could result in higher costs to the state in utilizing technology in teaching and learning. Lack of a unified vision between the state and local districts and schools will increase the amount of time it will take to reach the goals of fully realizing the power of technology to improve teaching and learning.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- The Educational Technology specialist has negotiated the following state software contracts for Districts and Schools resulting in the collective savings of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of Utah which fund education.

Microsoft Select Agreement (All Microsoft software)

License provides deep discounts on all Microsoft products to for all computers/servers in K-12 schools

Savings to districts and schools: Approximately \$1.0 million)

Based on at least 20,000 licenses of Office and/or Windows at \$100 full price, no education/government discount)

SketchUp Pro (3D modeling software)

License provides free access to 100% of all computers in K-12 schools

Savings to districts and schools: Approximately \$1.0 million

(Based on at least 2000 computers at \$500 per seat no education/government discount))

VMWare Server Virtualization

License provides deep discounts on server virtualization software, reducing the need for districts and schools to add additional hardware.

Savings to districts and schools: Approximately \$2.5 million

(Based on at least 500 servers at \$5000 not needing to be purchased)

ESRI ArcGIS Version 10 (Geographic Information Software)

License provides free access to 100% of all computers in K-12 schools

Savings to districts and schools: Approximately \$1.0 million

(Based on at least 1000 computers at \$1000 per seat)

This software is also used by many districts to plan and monitor student transportation resulting in additional savings in fuel, maintenance, and time.

OnTrack: Utah's Professional Learning Center

The Educational Technology specialist monitors the technology for the OnTrack Professional Learning Center portal. OnTrack's growth as a professional learning portal began with a total redesign beginning in the April of 2009. Over the course of the last three years, 35 plus trainings have been held for staff both within the agency and across the state for districts and charter schools, reaching nearly 500 participants. Essentially starting from zero, once these participants were trained in using the system, they were able to begin creating professional development courses for educators. Over 2288 courses to date have been created since November of 2010, the ostensible start of full functionality of the system.

Over 20,955 educators have logged into the system to access their individual records, search for professional development, and/or register for courses

Savings to districts and schools: Approximately \$210,000 annually by having the state provide a centralized system for access to quality professional learning opportunities for teachers, administrators and other school personnel

- The Educational Technology specialist initiated within the Teaching and Learning department at USOE the vision, tools and resources necessary to pioneer and implement digital educational resources.

The potential savings in this area are very large. For example current math textbooks for 9<sup>th</sup> grade students cost on average at least \$50 per student. The textbook created by USOE will have a cost of only \$5 per, only if it is printed. It is free if delivered electronically.

Potential Savings: \$2.16 million

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

By providing the 41 districts and 86 charter schools access to negotiated state licenses for software, the state has been able to save millions of dollars, allowing districts and schools to use the savings to purchase additional computers and other need infrastructure to support teaching and learning with

technology.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

The state software licenses have saved the state alternative costs of approximately \$5 million just in the last 3 years.

The Educational Technology specialist, through the regular convening of district and school technology leader, have allowed this community to share best practices and solutions to avoid the costly duplication of effort, and the adoption of inadequate or ineffective technology implementations and practices.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

By staying tightly focused on three key areas, *Vision and Planning, Collaboration and Cooperation and Economies of Scale*, the Educational Technology specialist is able to assist USOE, districts and schools to maximize limited resources and to better leverage the power of technology tools and resources to improve teaching and learning for over 600,000 students and 24,000 teachers in every part of the state.

The Educational Technology specialist supports the Utah education system as it equips students with the technology skills and resources necessary to successfully live, learn, and work in the 21st century. The specialist serves as the vision leader for educational technology in Utah and supports local educational technology decisions and educational technology planning by convening people, sharing understandings and organizing economies of scale cooperation.

The total cost of the Educational Technology program is \$118,000 annually. The work of the specialist has directly and indirectly **saved Utah schools nearly \$6 million** through negotiating reduced rates on software for schools and providing tools and resources that have improved both the quality and efficiency of educational programs by better leveraging technology.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Educator Effectiveness for High Quality Education**

***Program Description:***

To ensure that high quality instruction is available to every Utah student, the *Utah Effectiveness Project for High Quality Education* was instituted in 2010 by the Utah State Board of Education (State Board Rule R277-530) to guide the development of quality teaching and quality leadership efforts statewide. The project began with the *Utah Effective Teaching Standards* and the *Utah Educational Leadership Standards*. These two sets of standards provide a basis for a coherent system for all state and local educators as they develop a vision of an effective statewide system of educator effectiveness. The program outlines three components for effective educator evaluation (Demonstration of Professional Accomplishment, Student Growth, and Stakeholder Input). The Educator Effectiveness program serves all students (approx. 600,000), teachers (approx. 30,000), and educational leaders (approx. 1,400) in the state and also supports the work of ten teacher and educational leadership preparation programs in the state.

***Program Structure:***

- Utah Teaching and Leadership Standards and descriptive rubrics
- A model Educator Evaluation System for teachers and educational leaders
- Alignment with teacher and educational leadership preparation programs
- Professional learning opportunities for all aspects of the program
- Development of opportunities for professional advancement

The activities of the program are authorized by the following Statutory Provisions:

Title 53A Chapter 6 Educator Licensing and Professional Practices Act;

53A-8a. (formerly known as SB64)

53A-6-102. Legislative findings on teacher quality;

53A-6-104. Board licensure;

53A-6-107. Program approval;

53A-6-108. Prohibition on use of degrees or credit from unapproved institutions;

53A-6-110. Administrative/supervisory letters of authorization;

53A-6-204. Contracts for acceptance of educational personnel;

53A-6-402. Evaluation information on current or prospective school employees – Notice to employee – Exemption from liability;

R277-502. Educator Licensing and Data Retention;

R277-503. Licensing Routes;

R277-505. Administrative License Area of Concentration and Programs;

R277-530. Utah Effective Teaching and Educational Leadership Standards;

R277-531. Public Educator Evaluation Requirements (PEER).

Title IIa

No Child Left Behind. Utah Waiver

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

**State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:**

The Educator Effectiveness Program is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Monitors and supports districts as they revise their educator evaluation programs to meet the requirements of Utah Code 53a and State Board Rule R277-531.
- Monitors the activities of The Public Education Evaluation Requirements (PEER) Committee instituted by State Board of Education to provide leadership for the ongoing approval of district Educator Evaluation plans and program implementation.
- Monitors compliance with the No Child Left Behind, Utah waiver.

**State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:**

Report compliance with No Child Left Behind, Utah Waiver.  
53A-8a-410. Report of educator ratings.  
Report of district program compliance to USOE administration and Utah State Board of Education as requested.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

The Educator Effectiveness program :

- Creates a cohesive and aligned statewide system for improving educator effectiveness.
- Uses teaching and educational leadership standards to make decisions about preparation programs, evaluation tools, professional development, licensing, recognition, and other related programs and requirements.
- Designs and implements rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for educators and educational leaders.
- Ensures instructional and leadership effectiveness by using multiple assessment measures, including performance observation, student growth measures, and stakeholder input measures.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 96,679
• State Appropriation Funds	\$ 175,394
• Federal Funds	\$
• Other (Describe):	
Total Funding	

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$ 177,625</li> <li>\$ 4,000</li> <li>\$ 26,668</li> <li>\$ 87,780</li> </ul>
Total Costs	\$272,073

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

If the above services, activities, and leadership were not provided:

- It would be necessary for LEAs to meet State Board and Utah Code requirements without the expertise of state facilitation, consultation, and professional development. Each district would need to develop, adapt, or adopt evaluation programs. Such an undertaking would require additional staff members in each district, additional professional development for existing and new employees.
- LEAs would plan, develop, and implement evaluation systems without statewide standards, observation measurement tools, evaluation model system, or statewide growth measures. Uniform statewide data would not be available.
- LEAs would not have the benefit of collaborative groups or the leadership to share planning with like districts as they develop new evaluation systems.
- LEAs would be conducting development work individually to meet State Board requirements. The reliability, validity, and comparability of the teaching and leadership standards, evaluation systems, and growth measures would be in question.
- The progress toward educator effectiveness in the state of Utah would be intermittent, not consistent, and no statewide measurement date would exist to provide assurance of comparability.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

The savings to the public education system in Utah as a result of the activities provided by the Educator Effectiveness project:

- Each LEA would research, plan, develop, pilot, implement, and evaluate its own evaluation system for teachers and education leaders. If this were accomplished with just one additional staff member per district, the total would be approximately \$5,600,000. If two staff members or support staff members were also needed, the total could exceed \$10,000,000. The addition of similar work done by Charter LEAs would increase the total further.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

The costs which, without the services described above, would be incurred state-wide:

- The cost of educators 1) not being held to high standards and expectations, 2) not being evaluated by valid and reliable measurement tools and growth measures, and 3) not using system-wide methods of evaluation to gather comparable data on educator quality and

effectiveness would be incurred.

- The impact of this Educator Effectiveness Project on the number of students in Utah Public Education is also significant. The number of students last year in our schools was 576,827. If each of these students failed to be college and career ready (CCR) because we neglected to increase educator effectiveness, then the cost of this is more than enormous. Hypothetically, if even 10% of our students failed to be College and Career Ready, then the cost to the 57,682 for a life-time could be upwards to \$900,000 each if each working year, a student could lose \$30,000 in annual income for 30 years.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

The costs which, without the services described above, would be incurred state-wide: The best alternative to providing the services, activities, and leadership by the personnel doing the Leadership Preparation and Effectiveness Project would be to have a private or not-for-profit consulting/facilitation firm assist LEAs with standards, evaluation, and student growth. The cost of this alternative method would include:

- Time spent facilitating all 41 districts and 95 charters –
- Time and materials for training, planning, developing, implementing standards, evaluation systems, and student growth measures –
- Time spent piloting and evaluating the LEA evaluation systems –
- The cost of these services over a five year timeframe (similar to this five year project) comparable to the services provided by the personnel doing this program times 112 LEAs = \$15,660,176 times five years = \$78,300,880 compared to \$699,115.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits***

Estimated System Savings and Alternative Costs:

(\$ 78,300,880 - \$699,115)=	\$ 77,601,765
Plus, Cost Avoidance:	\$ 15,000,000

---

Net Benefit of position to State: \$92,601,765

Benefit-Cost to State over time: 339

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Educator Licensing**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Educator Licensing section provides oversight and implementation of Utah Code Title 53A, Chapter 6 and Utah Administrative Rules R277-500 through R277-527. This involves all procedures and mechanisms utilized in the issuance of new Utah educator licenses, adding new credentials to existing licenses, and the renewal of Utah educator licenses. This section is unique in providing daily face to face customer assistance, a line dedicated to answering licensing questions, developing and monitoring plans of assistance for educators earning a license through an alternative route, managing large amounts of data regarding licensure, and conducting audits to ensure appropriate compliance with licensing policy and procedures.

Additionally, the section implements the background check requirements of Utah law; see 53A-6-401, 53A-1a-512.5, and 53A-3-410.

The section also provides data to the Utah Department of Human Resources for administration of the Teacher Salary Supplement Program for Math and Science teachers (see 53A-17a-156).

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The Educator Licensing section carries out functions of educator licensing associated with Utah Code Title 53A, Chapter 6 and Utah Administrative Rules R277-500 through R277-527. A time intensive function also includes providing data to the School Finance section of USOE for appropriate distribution of various legislative funding sources (Professional Staff Costs, Legislative Salary Adjustment, Supplies and Materials Funding), as well as reporting data as requested for legislative reporting associating with teacher licensure.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

State reporting occurs each year in the Teacher Quality report. The ask from the Education Interim Committee regarding the focus of the report varies from year to year. In addition, annual reports to Education Appropriations contain information about licensure fees and adjustments to fee schedules. The Educator Licensing section is responsible for data connected to the federal Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-335; HEOA); also known as Title II reporting. This reporting is in relation to licensure issuance and university teacher preparation program performance. The data is shared with Utah public and private universities and is reported back to the federal government for compliance purpose.

The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) – (United States Code Title 20 Section 7801) calls for reporting from SEAs on Highly Qualified Teachers and Equitable Distribution of teachers in

schools with high incidence of serving families at or below the poverty line. Data is reported to the Department of Education (federal) as part of a yearly report associated with Title IIA funding that supports ensuring teachers are qualified in the subjects they are assigned to teach.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The section allows for the review of educator licensure applications to ensure that all state requirements are met before the issuance of a new or amended license. This process ensures that all state laws and rules are followed which ensures that educators working in Utah public schools or accredited private schools meet the minimum requirements necessary to provide service to Utah students.

The section allows for a thorough review of a licensure applicants background, including the review of expunged records (77-40-109(2)), to ensure that licensed employees are appropriately screened prior to being given unsupervised access to Utah students.

The section provides alternative routes to licensure that allow non-traditional teacher candidates to meet the requirements for licensure without completing a full traditional preparation program. This includes working with universities and other institutions of higher education to ensure that appropriate courses are available for these working professionals. This service is of additional importance to our charter schools and small, rural school districts in allowing them to hire individual in hard-to-fill positions and provide them with the tools and training necessary to both meet state requirements and be successful in teaching Utah students.

The section facilitates data collection on educators working in Utah that allows for comparability between Utah LEAs. Data is provided to the general public, the Utah State Legislature, and LEAs themselves. Data is also provided to individuals requesting information under Utah code title 63G-2 (GRAMA).

The section helps facilitate Utah universities' and the USOE ARL's ability to submit HEOA Title II reports to the state in conjunction with Westat and ETS (which also works with ACTFL and ABCTE). The collection of reports allows the USOE to complete the federally required state report under this law.

The section is responsible for implementation of the "Utah Plan to Ensure High Quality Teachers for All Utah Students" required under ESEA (see <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/ut.pdf> ). The section is also responsible for establishing and maintaining definitions of "Highly Qualified" status for Utah teachers and the reporting of the number of classes taught by HQ teachers in the state each year.

The section helps LEAs recruit and facilitate the hiring of teachers through a contract with [www.teachers-teachers.com](http://www.teachers-teachers.com). For the 2012 school year, 53% of new hires in districts or regional service centers and 68% of new hires in charter schools were registered with teachers-teachers.

The section is responsible for managing the Educator Assessments used to meet the testing requirements in Utah law. This includes facilitation of assessment reviews and establishing both initial and finalized passing standards. It also includes advocating to testing companies when Utah's assessment needs are not met by existing assessments for the creation of new tests (see the creation of

the ETS Praxis II 5031 Elementary: Multiple Subjects test).

The section is responsible for ensuring that Utah teacher preparation programs in IHEs have met all requirements in board rule for such programs to recommend individuals for a Utah Educator license and that such individual have met all requirements for a Utah Educator license: This involves establishment of licensure procedures for licensure candidates as described above but also includes training of IHEs regarding Utah licensure requirements, communication with IHEs regarding requirement changes (i.e. adjustment of passing scores on teacher assessments) and effective dates, and participation in the program’s CAPE accreditation process.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$ 0</li> <li>\$ 0</li> <li>\$ 1,612,677.00 (Licensing/Background check fees)</li> </ul>
Total Funding	\$ 1,612,677.00

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$ 1,033,924.27</li> <li>\$ 7,358.07</li> <li>\$ 63,360.00</li> <li>\$</li> </ul>
Total Costs	\$ 1,104,642.34

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Without the fundamental licensure procedures listed above LEAs or consortia of LEAs would have to fund and provide evaluation services to ensure that educators working in their schools met the requirements established by the Utah State Board of Education and to establish individual guidelines for subject endorsements and other aspects of licensing that are not specifically detailed in Board rule. This duplication of service would exponentially increase the cost involved in these processes. Licensure may not be transferrable between LEAs as some LEAs might interpret board rule differently than others and therefore the pool of applicants for small charter schools or rural districts would decrease greatly as many new educators would focus effort in meeting licensure requirements for the larger, more urban districts.

This would also cause a fundamental difference in qualifications of teachers in various LEAs over time as requirements become less and less centralized. This difference in qualification would make the state vulnerable to lawsuits from students/parents with unequal access to qualified teachers; a civil rights issue.

In addition, unless some type of information sharing agreement was established between all LEAs then it would be possible that an educator dismissed from a position for cause, which is not necessarily a criminal conviction, but would result in a license revocation or suspension; may be able to meet licensure requirements for another LEA and secure employment.

If a centralized educator licensure/data system (CACTUS) was not provided, again, LEAs or consortia of LEAs would have to duplicate this service in order to provide and track educator qualifications. Additionally, any requests for data from the public or from the legislature would have to solicit information from each LEA and then manually compile the data while compensating for system differences and limitations.

If the state did not submit the HEOA Title II report, the state could be fined by the federal government for non-compliance. If the state did not have any central authority to submit such a report, students at Utah universities may become ineligible for federal funding for student aid (Pell grants, Stafford loans, etc.).

Failure to implement the HQ plan noted above and the HQ reporting required by ESEA would jeopardize the funding that the state and LEAs receive under ESEA; specifically under Title II of ESEA.

If the section did not provide an alternative route to licensing (ARL) the only route to meeting Board licensure requirements through university programs. University programs would have no incentive to create or maintain “competing” alternative programs as they do now. Many working professionals would be unable to simultaneously work and be prepared as an educator; thus decreasing our pool of potential educators.

Without the section to act as a contracting agent for Utah LEAs, LEAs or consortia of LEAs would have to provide funding to pay for recruiting services and programs (similar to those provided by [www.teachers-teachers.com](http://www.teachers-teachers.com)). This would increase the overall cost of providing these services and would greatly decrease the out-of-state recruiting ability of medium to small LEAs.

If the section did not manage educator assessments, including standards, then, again, LEAs or consortia of LEAs would have to fill all aspects of this requirement, including review of assessments and establishing passing standards. This could also lead to inconsistent standards and vulnerability to lawsuits based on unequal access to qualified teachers (see above) and limitation of license transferability (see above).

If the section did not work with universities regarding requirements, accreditation, and procedures not only would LEAs or consortia of LEAs have to fill these roles, but it would also increase personnel costs at universities as they would need to track multiple licensing requirements, guidelines, and procedures. It is possible that rather than incurring the increased cost that universities would focus on meeting the needs of the large LEAs leaving the medium to small LEAs with a smaller and smaller pool of candidates meeting their requirements.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Minimum 2 FTE (1 specialist, 1 support) per small LEA/Charter (112): \$19,376,000  
Minimum 4 FTE (2 specialist, 2 support) per medium to large LEAs (14): \$4,844,000

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Potential Lawsuits regarding child abuse if Background Checks are not performed; estimate 6 million children per year involved in child abuse report out of 75 million children in the U.S. (8%), estimate 47,000 reports of abuse to students in Utah schools (8% of student population), estimate 10,000 of those involving teachers; awards ranging from settlements (\$25,000 per) to severe awards (>\$1,000,000) and including legal fees; averaging to \$100,000 per suit: ~\$1,000,000,000

Potential civil rights lawsuits regarding inequitable distribution of qualified teachers: rulings of such lawsuits may or may not result in monetary damage, but would cost resources to defend against such lawsuits: \$5,000,000

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

HEOA Title II noncompliance fee, ~\$28,000 per IHE and state: \$308,000

Loss of access to federal Pell Grants for Utah IHE students: estimate 158,000 IHE students in Utah out of 21,000,000 IHE students in US, 0.75238%, percentage of federal allocation: ~\$310,000,000

Loss of LEA ESEA Title II funding (not including state administration funding) for noncompliance with HQ plan: ~15,000,000

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Funding Generated: \$1,6635,495.00 (Does not include UPPAC fees)

Section/Program Cost: \$1,359,025

Section/Program Savings: \$24,220,000

Section/Program Cost Avoidance: > \$1,000,000,000

Alternative Costs: \$325,308,000

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Utah Electronic High School**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- The Utah Electronic High School (EHS) provides accredited high school credit recovery, credit acceleration, and original credit to Utah minors and adults.
- The EHS student body includes students enrolled in public, private, and home schools as well as adults seeking high school credit.
- EHS works in partnership with local schools. Credit earned at EHS is recorded on the student's transcript at their school of record and is applied toward the student's requirements for graduation.
- During FY 13, EHS provided services year round July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013.
- During FY 13, EHS offered a diploma track for adults and for home-schooled minors.
- During FY 13, EHS provided the classroom portion of Driver Education to Utah residents.

The program is authorized by Utah state code:

- **53A-15 sections 1000-1008** (Electronic High School) and
- **53A-13 section 209** (Driver Education)

Implementation is governed by the following board rules:

- **R277-725** Electronic High School
- **R277-604.5** Utah Electronic High School (EHS) Students
- **R277-419** Pupil Accounting

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Provides open-entry/open-exit 9-12 grade level courses to Utah students
- Coordinates the statewide Utah Electronic High School infrastructure

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section provides data upon request to administrators, legislators and public entities.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

***ACCREDITED HIGH SCHOOL CREDIT***

For 18 years, EHS has provided a flexible online option for students to earn high school credit year round. Since 2004, 52,937 students have earned EHS credit.

***CURRICULUM***

The EHS high school developed curriculum is open for Utah teachers and public schools to use and/or adapt to meet local needs. All improvements EHS continues to make to the curriculum are shared under the Creative Commons license. Districts do not have to get 'permission' to use the EHS curriculum in their own programs. To some degree, these districts used some EHS curriculum for their own programs: Nebo, Weber, Davis, Jordan, Murray, Park City, Tooele, and Granite. Using EHS-created curriculum frees the district from the cost/burden of 'renting' curriculum from a commercial vendor.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, etc.):**

State Legislative Funds	\$ 1,005,700	
State Appropriation Funds	\$ 75,996	
Federal Funds	\$ 99,597	(Federal Mineral Lease)
Other (carry-over at Fiscal Agent LEA):	\$ 1,447,656	
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>\$ 2,628,949</b>	

**Section Costs:**

Faculty/etc. Costs at Fiscal Agent LEA	\$ 1,162,849	(Jul-Feb)
Personnel Costs at USOE	\$ 383,324	
Administrative costs at USOE	\$ 47,315	
Faculty Costs at USOE	\$ 340,446	(Mar-Jun)
Return to Driver Ed	\$ 420,394	
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$ 2,354,328</b>	
Carry forward to FY14	\$ 274,621	

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

In FY13, 10,556 students would not have earned an average of a semester's worth of high school online credit in the EHS open-entry/open-exit format.

District online programs would not have the EHS curriculum to jump-start their own programs.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

EHS has a cost savings of about 50% of other Utah virtual schools. For example, in FY11, the Utah Virtual High School expenditures were \$11,347,699 for the average daily membership of 2,015. Assuming 6 successful credits per student per year, the cost per student was \$5,390.49. The Utah Electronic High School total expenditures for FY11 were approximately \$2.5 million. EHS students (FTE 1,014) were successful in earning the equivalent of 6 full credits each. The approximate cost per student per year was \$2,465.50.

For FY13 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013) 8,559 students earned 18,267 quarter credits at EHS. This number

does not include driver education completions. (2,345 completions)

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

EHS helps Utah students graduate from high school on-time by providing year-round open-entry/open-exit credits for their transcripts.

EHS helps Utah students graduate from high school early, In past seven years, over 5,000 early graduates also earned credit from EHS.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

The monies expended for EHS services stayed inside Utah to pay for Utah teachers to develop curriculum to deliver online instruction to Utah students. The cost for the equivalent number of credits for those students would have been born by local districts.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

EHS provides flexible online credits at no cost to districts for students pursuing high school diplomas from their local high schools. High school graduates contribute in the state economy more effectively than students who fail to earn diplomas.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Elementary Mathematics Core Curriculum Support**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning Elementary Mathematics Specialist reports to the STEM Coordinator who in turn reports to the Director of Teaching and Learning. The Specialist provided technical support and leadership in the development and improvement of mathematics education in the elementary schools in the state. The Specialist plans, develops, promotes, implements, and evaluates programs in mathematics. The Specialist provides training and professional development for LEA Math Coordinators, District Curriculum Directors, principals, teachers, and parents. The Specialist communicates the Core Standards and associated pedagogy through e-mail, social media, telephone, and in person. The Specialist coordinates with Institutions of Higher Education to improve the preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers, administrators, and other school personnel. The Specialist plans and implements professional development with LEA leaders, principals, and teachers.

**State Math Educational Coordinating Committee** – This is a committee of mathematics leaders and coordinators from each of the LEA’s in the state. The Specialist meets with them four times a year (minimum) to provide professional development, information on the mathematics core, get input on proposed board rule changes, provide legislative and board updates, and maintain a lively sense of community.

**Core Academy – Kindergarten Through Fifth Grade Mathematics** – One thousand two hundred and fifty six teachers were trained this last summer in the core academy. The focus was on understanding the content and teaching of the Utah Core State Standards. In addition, over 500 mathematical units were written based on the core standards which will be available to teachers after editing and piloting. The units will be linked to the standards on the UEN website.

**Utah Core State Standards Transition:** Provided leadership and content expertise to assist LEA leaders, principals, and teachers in transitioning to the Utah Core State Standards in Mathematics. Activities included leading teacher/math coach committees in vetting and revising instructional and assessment tasks created in the Core Academy, writing and revising Parent Guides for each grade level and publishing them in Spanish, creating open education resources for students and teachers, providing professional development in person and on-line, working on teacher professional development modules to be delivered on-line.

**Vetting Mathematical Tasks Written in the Core Academy:** Conducted two 2-day workshops and one 1-day workshop in which teachers and math coaches carefully examined the tasks written in the 2011 and 2012 core academies, ranked them according to a rubric and determined which should be kept, fixed, or discarded.

**Elementary Principals Mathematics and Science Leadership Academy** – Provided learning experiences for elementary school principals to strengthen their leadership in assisting their students to excel in Mathematics and Science studies. In the last three years 105 principals have “graduated” from the academy. It appears that the academy is one-of-a-kind. We have been unable to find another professional development offering like it in the United States.

**Elementary Mathematics Endorsement:** Elementary teachers may take 18 semester hours of courses which qualify them for an endorsement in elementary mathematics. The program raises their level of content expertise as well as their pedagogical skills in mathematics. The program was created and is administered, monitored and improved by this section. In the last two years the frameworks were revised and common assessment items were written for mid-term and final exams. Instructors were given guidelines on using the assessments.

**STEM Activities:** Worked with two elementary schools and two universities on their transition to STEM schools. Served on the advisory board for Westridge, one of the two schools named above. Collected research and materials for the schools and gave advice and counsel on their operation.

**Planned and Conducted Professional Development:** Planned and conducted mathematics professional development for Wayne County School District and the Utah Professional Development Center.

**Overall Leadership Activities:** Provided many other learning opportunities for LEA mathematics leaders, teachers, and parents through conference presentations, e-mails, phone calls, and personal contact. Serve on task forces with the USHE system to “tune” the elementary education teacher education system. Serve on other committees as needed. Serve on a national level state collaborative sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers. Maintain the integrity of the core curriculum by clarifying its intent.

**Statutory provisions:**

Utah Code Annotated 53A-1-302

Board Rules on Core R277-700, R277-519

Board Rules on Licensing R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520

Utah Code on Licensing 53A-6

Board Rules on Instructional materials R277-269

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The Teaching and Learning Section Elementary Mathematics Specialist:

- Ensures that instructional materials recommended are aligned to the Utah Core State Standards.
- Maintains the integrity of the core standards by monitoring published versions
- Ensures that information disseminated to LEAs is evidence-based and up to date.
- Meets regularly with LEA mathematics coordinators to conduct professional development and give updates on board rules, legislation, and best practice.
- Provides guidance to LEAs on core standards, board rules, and accepted procedures
- Ensures that elementary mathematics endorsement applications are processed according to established rules and procedures.
- Monitors instruction in elementary mathematics endorsement classes to ensure quality and compliance with approved course frameworks
- Acts as a liaison with the Elementary Education Majors Committee of the Utah System of Higher Education.
- Directs preparation of professional development materials for the Core Academy and other workshops and courses, including on-line courses and ensures the materials are aligned to the core standards.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning Section is responsible to provide reports on request.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

1. A total of 1265 teachers completed the Core Academy sessions in elementary mathematics this summer. Evaluations showed that 92% of participants felt they would be able to apply what they learned and that 85% are ready to apply what they learned.
2. This year 48 teachers from around the state were trained to facilitate professional development on the core standards in mathematics. They then facilitated the sessions of the core academy, giving them valuable experience toward conducting follow-up professional development in their LEA's.
3. Approximately 500 mathematical units in grades Kindergarten through six were written this summer by Core Academy participants and facilitators. Those units cover the entire breadth of the Utah Core State Standards in mathematics in grades K-5.

- 4. Vetted over 1000 mathematical tasks and prepared them for publishing on the UEN web site.
- 5. In the past fiscal year 28 principals attended the Elementary Principals Mathematics and Science Leadership Academy. Evaluations were overwhelmingly positive and indicate that principals are ready to move forward with assisting teachers in changing their practice in mathematics.
- 6. In this fiscal year 250 currently practicing elementary teachers earned elementary mathematics endorsement.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Appropriation Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul>	<p>\$ 39,000.00</p> <p>\$ 10,000.00</p> <p>\$</p>
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>\$ 49,000.00</b>

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> </ul>	<p>\$ 135,874.34</p> <p>\$ 3,886.17</p> <p>\$ 5,664.00</p> <p>\$ 17,391.92</p>
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$ 162,816.43</b>

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Since most LEAs have limited or no professional development funds activities like the core academy would be impossible. There would be no possibility of uniform standards or training across the state. LEAs receiving lower per pupil receipts could offer relatively fewer professional development opportunities to their staff, eventually leading to legal challenges given inequalities district to district. LEAs would have to shoulder all professional development costs. There would be no statewide principal’s academy, therefore administrator training in best administrative practice in mathematics and science would be stymied. Coordination of unit creation would not exist and those units, even if they were created, would be available to the teachers in the LEA rather than widely across the state. When those plans are in the UEN database and linked to the standards they will be used extensively. That would not happen without statewide programs like the core academy. There would not have been a revised Elementary Mathematics Endorsement, nor would the endorsement continue to be monitored, improved and approved through collaboration of LEAs and higher education with USOE staff.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Professional Development: Core Academy cost versus consultant costs – for elementary mathematics the cost of the Core Academy was \$231,603.78. A comparable training from a commercial vendor costs \$500 per participant, not counting logistics. 1256 participants at \$500 each = \$628,000. **Cost savings are estimated at \$396,396.22**

Elementary Principals Mathematics and Science Leadership Academy: The academy costs \$30,000 a year to run. This includes all materials, travel, lodging, meals, and fees for presenters. A comparable program at the Principal Training Center for International Schools costs \$1995 per participant for 7 days without lodging. The extrapolated cost for 10 days is \$2850. We accommodated 28 principals this year. 28 principals x \$2850 = \$79,800. Add in lodging for half the participants (14) at \$95 per day for 7 days = \$9310. Total cost is \$89,110. **Total cost savings for 28 principals is \$59,100.**

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Elementary Mathematics Endorsement Costs: 250 endorsements at one hour processing per endorsement is 250 hours at \$38 per hour. **If the cost were passed on to LEA's there would be a cost of at least \$9500.**

Curriculum Delivery – each of the 500 units developed this summer was written by a team of teachers at the core academy, for an estimated cost of nothing since all the development was done on-line. Development in the districts would cost an estimated \$500 per unit, for a **total cost avoidance of \$250,000.**

Vetting Math Tasks – each of the 1000 math tasks vetted this year was done in a one or two day workshop. The workshop cost is the cost of a substitute per teacher and travel costs. Estimated sub costs per day are \$100, and average travel reimbursement is \$25, for a total of \$12,500 for 4 vetting workshops. If LEAs vetted the tasks individually the cost could amount to \$1,700,000. **Total estimated cost avoidance is \$1,687,500**

Event planning services \$500 x 30 events (done by assistant) = \$15,000

Accounting functions done by assistant (participant travel and reimbursement services = \$20,000

**Estimated cost avoidance to districts is estimated at \$35,000**

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

**\$2,437,496.22**

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Costs are \$162,816. Benefits are estimated to be \$2,437,496. The benefit-cost: 14.9

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Enhancement for Accelerated Students Program**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Enhancement for Accelerated Students Program encompasses the following programs: Advanced Placement, Gifted and Talented and International Baccalaureate.

**Advanced Placement** - The sections Gifted and Talented specialist provides 131 schools with information about Advancement Placement courses, professional development opportunities, student recruiting strategies, and data regarding Advance Placement exam pass rates. Advanced Placement courses provide challenging college –level experiences that assist students in developing successful college readiness skills.

**Gifted and Talented** – The program provides gifted and talented support to 131 schools in the following areas: learning and development of accelerated students, identification assessments, curriculum planning and instruction, programming options and professional development.

**International Baccalaureate** – The sections Gifted and Talented Specialist provides 11 schools with information about International Baccalaureate programs and courses, professional development opportunities, student recruiting strategies and data regarding exam pass rates.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code Sections: 53A-17a165, 53A-1-401(3), Implementation is governed by Board Rule R277-707.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Enhancement for Accelerated Students Program implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Collect and report participating student data
- Prepare and implement policy and procedures to ensure compliance with : 53A-17a165, 53A-1-401(3), and Board Rule R277-707
- Monitor school compliance
- Ensure that all educators working with students are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Provide technical assistance to teachers, principals, and LEAs
- Calculate and distribute funding

- Monitor use of funds
- Provide Professional development for LEA leaders

**State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:**

The Utah State Office of Education teaching and Learning section is responsible to complete an annual report to the legislature and to provide additional reports and information upon request. The annual report includes the following performance criteria:

- Number of identified students disaggregated by subgroups;
- Graduation rates of identified students;
- Number of AP classes taken, completed, and exams passes with a score of 3 or above by identified students;
- Number of IB classes taken, completed, and exams passed with a score of 4 or above by identified students;
- Number of Concurrent Enrollment classes taken and credit earned by identified students;
- ACT or SAT data;
- Gains in proficiency in language arts; and
- Gains in proficiency in mathematics.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

**Summary of effectiveness and progress:**

Advanced Placement:

Year	Number of Test Takers	Number of Exams Passed +3
12-13	20,622	22,383
11-12	19,002	20,883
10-11	17,163	18,672

International Baccalaureate:

Year	Number of Students	Number of Exams Passed with +4
12-13	1,132	1,406
11-12	1,124	1,240
10-11	891	944

Gifted and Talented:

	District	Charter
<b>Performance Criteria</b>		
Number of identified students K-12 whose academic achievement is accelerated	108,439	10,946
Total Elementary Students (K-6)	19,238	4,461
Total Middle/Junior High Students (7-9)	33,662	2,748
Total High School Students (10-12)	55,539	3,737

<b>Demographics</b>		
Multi-racial	2,886	198
Hispanic/Latino	10,348	1,036
Black/African American	852	139
Asian	3,353	395
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1,493	167
American Indian/Alaskan Native	707	63
White	88,748	8,905
Other	54	43
Total	108,439	10,946
<b>Seniors &amp; Graduation</b>		
Total number of identified students who started the academic year as a senior	18,080	814
Total number of identified students who graduated	17,549	797
<b>Advanced Placement</b>		
Total number of identified students taking AP classes	29,327	753
Total number of identified students completing AP classes	27,740	686
Total number of identified students passing AP exams with a score of 3 or higher	14,360	417
<b>International Baccalaureate</b>		
Total number of identified students taking IB classes	2,029	293
Total number of identified students completing IB classes	1,950	293
Total number of identified students passing IB exams with a score of 4 or higher	1,365	No exams*
<b>Concurrent Enrollment</b>		
Total number of identified students taking Concurrent Enrollment courses	21,379	1,396
Total number of identified students completing Concurrent Enrollment courses	21,980	1,383
Total number of identified students earning credit in Concurrent Enrollment courses	21,173	1,357
<b>ACT</b>		
Math (22)	15,319	871
English (18)	23,467	1,128
Reading (21)	20,220	943
<b>K-12 Program</b>		
Total number of identified students who gained or topped out in proficiency in Mathematics CRT	47,127	6,731

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

State Education Funds	\$ 4,047,861
Federal Funds	\$ 0

Other (Describe):	\$ 0
Total Funding	\$ 4,047,861

**Section Costs:**

Personnel Costs	\$65,149
Travel Expenses	\$ 1,581
Current Expenses	\$ 1,234
Program	\$ 3,979,897
Total Costs	\$4,047,861

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Failure of the section to provide the above services would result in the USOE being noncompliant with Utah Legislative direction, the inability of LEAs to implement the program. The Enhancement of Accelerated Students Program oversight and implementation as outlined in statute and Board rule require the efforts of a qualified staff member working in concert with trained teachers, principals, and LEA staff. The loss of the program would impact students and communities who are benefiting from the program which could result in reduced achievement and poor post-secondary participation.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

131 Utah LEAs receive significant cost savings from the work of the Teaching and Learning section and services associated with the Enhancement of Accelerated Students Program, including:

- Technical Assistance (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Monitoring (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Professional Development (\$10,000 per LEA)

These amounts are estimated based upon current costs and current economy scale.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

LEAs are able to avoid individual program costs amounting to \$30,000 each or 131 times \$30,000 which equals \$3,930,000. The work of the section ensures integrity to the purpose and implementation of the legislative funding at minimal financial cost.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

\$30,000 per LEA or \$ 3,930,000 statewide.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

LEAs are able to avoid individual program costs amounting to \$30,000 each or 131 times \$30,000 which equals \$3,930,000. The work of the section ensures integrity to the purpose and implementation of the legislative funding at minimal financial cost.

***Summary of Benefits and Costs:***

***Net Benefits: \$3,930,000***

***Benefit/Cost: 59***

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: ESEA and Special Programs, Instructional Programs**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Federal Programs Section provides state leadership and collaboration, transparency, oversight, support and professional development to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) as they implement programs associated with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The funding for these federal programs is available only with State Education Agency oversight. The federal and state programs assigned to this section include the following:

- Title I, Part A – Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged = **\$88,031,798 – serving approximately 104,000 students**
  - Title I School Improvement
  - Title I Preschool Programs
  - Title I Parental Involvement
- State Funded Para-Professional Supplement to Title I Schools in Improvement = **\$300,000 – serving approximately 6,400 students**
- Title I, Part C – Migrant Education Program = **\$1,807,025 – serving approximately 1,100 eligible students**
  - Title I, Part C – Migrant Education Program – Consortium Leader, Multi-State Initiative **\$60,000 – serving approximately 600 students**
- Title III, Part A – English Language Learner Services = **\$4,203,597 – serving approximately 58,000 students. Services provided through SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) and WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) training is implemented state-wide, affecting nearly all teachers and students.**
  - Title III, Immigrant Services
  - Title III Parental Involvement
  - Teacher Qualifications – ELL Endorsement
  - Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)
  - World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards
- Title IV, Part B – 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers = **\$7,061,349 – serving approximately 25,000 students**
- Title VII, Part A - American Indian Education Program = **\$1,356,033 - serving approximately 7,400 students**
- Homeless Education – Title VII, Part B – McKinney-Vento Federal Grant = **\$394,145 – serving approximately 12,000 students**
- State funded Enhancement for At-Risk Students Program = **\$23,384,300 – serving approximately 40,000 students**
  - Math, Engineering, Science Achievement Program (MESA) – 13 LEAs continuing services
  - Highly Impacted Schools – 23 LEAs continuing services
  - ELL Family Literacy Centers – 10 LEAs continuing services

- Gang Prevention: Competitive Grants – 10 LEAs; Discretionary Fund Grants – 5 LEAs
- Other targeted services to at-risk students – 33 LEAs providing services

These programs are mandated by the following code(s):

Utah Constitution, Article X, Section 3, which vests general control and supervision of public education in the Utah State Board of Education:

Public Law 97-110 (federal law) Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as reauthorized  
34 C.F.R. Section 200 (federal regulation) Title I--Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged

53A-1-901-904 (state statute) Implementing Federal Programs

R277-404 (board rule) Requirements for Assessments of Student Achievement

R277-425 (board rule) Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing for Utah School Districts

R277-426 (board rule) Definition of Private and Non-Profit Schools for Federal Program Services

R277-470 (board rule) Charter Schools

R277-510 (board rule) Educator Licensing - Highly Qualified Assignment

34 C.F.R. Section 200 (federal regulation) Title I, Part C - Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged; Migrant Education

34 C.F.R. Section 3101-3102 (federal regulation) Title III, Part A – Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students

R277-112 (board rule) Prohibiting Discrimination in the Public Schools

R277-716 (board rule) Alternative Language Services for Utah Students

34 C.F.R. Section 200 (federal regulation) Title IV, Part B, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers

34 C.F.R. Section 200 (federal regulation) Title VII, Part B – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

R277-616 (board rule) Education for Homeless and Emancipated Students

Subpart 1; 20 U.S.C. 7421–7429, 7491–7492 - Office of Indian Education Title VII Indian Education Formula Grant

53A-17a-161 English Language Learner Family Literacy Centers Program (Previous State Statute)

R277-715 English Language Learner Family Literacy Centers Program (Previous Board Rule, no specific funding but program still supported based on LEA request)

R277-46 Highly Impacted Schools (Previous Board Rule, no specific funding but program still supported based on LEA request)

53A-17a-121 (State Statute) State Appropriations for At-Risk Programs (previous statute)

R277-717 (Board Rule) Math engineering Science Achievement (MESA) (previous rule)

R277-708 Enhancement for At-Risk Students (New Board Rule)

R277. Education, Administration. Ensure that all identified ELL/LEP students receive English language development services

R277-524. Paraprofessional/Paraeducator Programs, Assignments, and Qualifications

R277-716-4A(3) (Board Rule) State ESL Endorsement requirements provided through Educator ELL Endorsement Process management

R277-716 (Board Rule) WIDA training and implementation, SIOP training and implementation

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

**Federal TITLE Programs**

#### (TITLE I, Part A) - College and Career Ready

Title I, Part A provides Utah with Federal funds each year to help higher poverty schools provide supplemental educational services to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged students; incorporate consistency in Title I preschools and ensure Federally mandated Parental involvement is addressed in every LEA and School program.

#### (TITLE I, Part C) - Migrant Education

The goal of the Migrant Education Program is to ensure that all migrant students reach challenging academic standards and graduate with a high school diploma or complete a GED that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

#### (TITLE III, Part A) - ELL Services

Title III, Part A: This program is designed to improve the education of limited English proficient (LEP) children and youths by helping them learn English and meet challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards. The program provides enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youths. Funds are distributed based on a formula that takes into account the number of immigrant and LEP students in the state.

#### (TITLE IV, Part B) - 21st Century

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program is a competitive federal grant for LEAs and Community or Faith-Based Organizations to serve students and their families attending schools with poverty levels of 40 percent or higher outside of regular school hours.

#### (TITLE VII, Part A) - Indian Education

It is the purpose of this part to support the efforts of local educational agencies, Indian tribes and organizations, postsecondary institutions, and other entities to meet the unique educational and culturally related academic needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students, so that such students can meet the same challenging State student academic achievement standards as all other students are expected to meet.

#### (TITLE IIV, Part B) - Homeless Education

Under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Children and Youths Program, State educational agencies (SEAs) must ensure that homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free public education, including a public preschool education, as is provided to other children and youth. States must review and undertake steps to revise any laws, regulations, practices, or policies that may act as barriers to the enrollment, attendance, or success in school of homeless children and youth.

### **State Programs**

**The MESA Program** - Utah MESA is a member of MESA USA, a partnership of MESA programs from several states. The programs are based on a common academic enrichment model to support students so they excel in math and science. MESA USA serves as an arena for the programs to share best practices to continually refine and improve the MESA model. The

organization also seeks to establish new programs to reach more students who need MESA's services. This program was previously required by Utah Legislature, and although the specific funding has been withdrawn, the LEAs still look for program consistency and management, which this section's Education Specialist provides through support of the Enhancement for At-Risk funding.

**The SIOP Program Training and Implementation** - Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol® (SIOP®) provides concrete examples of the features of Sheltered Instruction that can enhance and expand teachers' instructional practice. The protocol is composed of thirty features grouped into eight main components: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice and Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review and Assessment. These components emphasize the instructional practices that are critical for second language learners as well as high-quality practices that benefit all students.

**The WIDA Program Training and Implementation** – Utah State Board of Education has adopted the WIDA standards World-class Instructional Design and Assessment of teaching and assessing students learning a second language. The WIDA ELP Standards along with their strands of model performance indicators-which represent social, instructional and academic language-have been augmented by TESOL as the national model.

**ELL Family Literacy Centers** – These centers provide interactive literacy activities between parents and their children; training for parents on how to be the primary teacher for their children, and to be full partners in the education of their children; parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency; and an age-appropriate education to prepare children for their success in school and life experiences. Student extended-day or year around services include: tutoring, optional extended kindergarten and credit recovery. Program focus is on parent outreach through home visits, newcomer programs, early childhood education, and planning strategies to meet the English Language Learner needs. Parent skill enhancements include: assisting in computer literacy/workforce skills, high school courses targeted to obtain a GED, and translation services. This program was previously required by Utah Legislature, and although the specific funding has been withdrawn, the LEAs still look for program consistency and management, which the USOE Education Specialist provides through support of the Enhancement for At-Risk funding.

**Highly Impacted Schools** – These are schools that have been determined to be the most highly impacted by students who need to overcome compacted obstacles of poverty, ethnical minority, and frequent mobility that results in poor academic achievement, as defined by state statute and the state board rule. This program was previously required by Utah Legislature, and although the specific funding has been withdrawn, the LEAs still look for program consistency and management, which the USOE Education Specialist provides through support of the Enhancement for At-Risk funding.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- **All following items require the gathering, analysis, interpretation and submission of required data points to the Federal Government. The USOE creates the mechanisms and consistent business rules to accomplish this.**
- 21st Century Community Learning Center (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) competitive grant application process through the Utah Consolidated Application (UCA).
- 21st CCLC grantee budget report.
- 21st CCLC grant recipients program evaluation.
- 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information and Collection System (PPICS).
- 21st CCLC grantee self-evaluation on Utah Afterschool Program Quality Assessment and Improvement Tool.
- Federally required monitoring of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantee programs through the Tracker/Desktop Monitoring Instrument (DMI).
- LEA Title I Plan & Application for Funds through Utah Consolidated Application (UCA).
- Title I Maintenance of Effort Report - Generated at the USOE and based on LEA previous reporting points.
- Title I Private School Report.
- Title I Statistical Performance Report.
- Title I Comparability Report.
- Title I Desktop Monitoring Report and Documentation Report, submitted by LEAs through the Tracker/Desktop Monitoring Report (DMI).
- Title I Schools in Improvement - Revised school improvement plan is required of those 24 schools newly identified as Focus schools. Budgets accompany all school improvement plans. Quarterly reports are completed by the School Support Team leader. Reports are sent to the school, district, and to the USOE through the Tracker/Desktop Monitoring Instrument (DMI).
- ARRA SIG applications have identified Priority Schools under an ESEA Waiver granted to the State of Utah. There are specific requirements for reporting and accountability associated with this voluntary, competitive application. Reports are sent to the USOE through the Tracker/Desktop Monitoring Instrument (DMI).
- LEA Title III Plan & Application for Funds Utah Consolidated Application (UCA).
- Title III Desktop Monitoring Report and Documentation Report to be implemented into the Tracker/Desktop Monitoring Instrument (DMI).
- Title III District in Improvement - These are LEAs who have failed Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) two and four years in a row. They have submitted a district improvement plan with a budget last year and are implementing this year. A progress report/personal meeting is due annually.
- MAPS/Teacher ratings – Student Level data elements required by the federal Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) that are not obtained through the Utah Data Warehouse - this information is reported through the MAPS system by participating LEAs and shared within the Migrant Consortium of Western States.
- Title I, Part C – LEA Plan and Migrant Education Application through the Utah Consolidated Application (UCA).
- Title I, Part C - Desktop Monitoring Report and Documentation Report completed by the LEAs through the Tracker/Desktop Monitoring Instrument (DMI).
- National Certificates of Eligibility (COE) entered through the MAPS Utah Migrant Education

data system.

- McKinney-Vento Homeless Sub-Grant Application process managed by the USOE every 3 years to determine eligible LEAs based on Federal guidance.
- LEA Homeless Evaluation reflects the accumulation of data gathered at the LEA level.
- McKinney-Vento Homeless “Point-in-Time Report” is a snapshot of all eligible students within LEAs.
- McKinney-Vento “Homeless Cumulative Report” is a total count of all students served throughout Utah for each school year.
- Evaluation of the ELL Family Literacy Centers is managed through contract and reports submitted by an outside evaluation team. The USOE constructed the RFP for services requested by Utah State Legislature that required evaluation of previously funded ELL Family Literacy Centers from an outside, unbiased source. The USOE ensures that the contract recipient provides consistent clear and fair analysis, and provides all information requested by the Utah State Legislature regarding the program implementation, use and constructive outcomes. This reduces the burden on each participating LEA by managing the contract (as directed legislatively), setting up a budget, and processing invoices submitted by the outside contractor.
- Implementation and support of ELL learning software, Imagine Learning, is managed through contract and reports submitted by an outside provider. The USOE constructed the RFP for services requested by Utah State Legislature that required development and implementation of ELL learning software from an outside source. The USOE ensures that the contract recipient provides consistent and fair services, provides all information requested by the Utah State Legislature regarding the program implementation, use and constructive outcomes. This reduces the burden on each participating LEA by managing the contract (as directed legislatively), setting up a budget, and processing invoices submitted by the outside contractor.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 23,684,300
• Federal Funds	\$ 101,497,914
• Other (Describe):	\$ _____
• Total Funding	\$ 125,182,214

**Section Costs:**

• All Personnel Costs (Salary and Benefits)	\$ 1,516,525
• All Travel Expenses	\$ 52,922
• All Current Expenses (includes contracts)	\$ 501,396
• All Other Charges (Indirect Costs)	\$ <u>152,733</u>
• Total Costs	\$ 2,223,576

**Remainder of Funding Sources above go directly to LEAs: \$122,958,638 (98.23%)**

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

Impact on Utah Students:

The students served by the Federal and Special programs group are historically at-risk populations that without significant supports tend not to achieve academic success, English proficiency, or graduate from high school. Current research from the Department of Workforce Services highlights the impact on employability and income earned for those who do not successfully graduate from high school.

Employment Rates:

- For students that have not received a high school diploma, the unemployment rate in 2011 was 14.1%
- For those who have a high school diploma, the unemployment rate drops to 9.4%
- For those who have received a bachelor's degree, the unemployment rate further drops to 4.9%

Annual Income:

- For students that have not received a high school diploma, the average annual income in 2011 was \$23,452
- For those who have a high school diploma, the average annual income increases to \$33,176
- For those who have received a bachelor's degree the average annual income is \$54,756

In summary, the interventions available to help at-risk students achieve academic success, including high school graduation and moving on to graduate from college reduces unemployment by more than half and increases personal income by more than 100%.

Data also shows that a larger percent of youth who do not graduate from high school are involved in criminal activities that lead to incarceration. Each incarcerated individual will serve as a burden on the State. It is estimated that each inmate in the Utah State Prison costs the state approximately \$70,000 a year.

Impact on Utah Districts and Charter Schools:

The Utah State Office of Education fulfills critical roles in the approval, monitoring, and technical assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs). These roles are required by federal statute in association with federal funding to education. Federal requires LEAs to receive grants and submit all required documentation to the U.S. Department of Education through the State Education Agency (SEA). LEAs are not permitted to submit plans, applications, compliance monitoring reports, statistical data, and reimbursement requests directly to the U.S. Department of Education. Each LEA would have to negotiate with the U.S. Department of Education to identify an acceptable third party to perform the roles of the SEA. This process would be costly, time consuming, and would require additional staff and/or contracting with outside providers to fulfill requirements. All Federal Programs are administered by staff who are funded through the small (1% and 5%) SEA administrative set-aside of federal funds. In the event that the SEA did not perform these tasks, the costs of the following required SEA responsibilities would be passed on to each LEA:

- Title I School Improvement Responsibilities: LEAs would be responsible to hire an outside agency (with knowledge of all Title I school improvement requirements and fiscal issues associated with approved expenditure of funds); to provide professional development; conduct onsite monitoring; prepare monitoring reports; provide technical assistance; monitor reimbursement requests before sending them to the US Department of Education for approval to avoid mismanagement of funds; all LEA plans would have to be approved by the US Department of Education. All questions would have to be directed to the US Department of

Education; to send and receive information through the US Department of Education would result in major delays for the LEAs. The US Department of Education would also have to hire additional personnel in order to handle the additional correspondence from state LEAs.

- Title I Compliance Monitoring: LEAs would need to develop a Title I monitoring system to meet federal regulations.
- Federal Student Loan Forgiveness: A third party contractor would need to be hired to manage the teacher loan forgiveness program.
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC): Grantees would be responsible to hire outside agencies to provide professional development; conduct onsite monitoring; prepare monitoring reports; provide technical assistance; monitor reimbursement requests before sending them to the U.S. Department of Education for approval to avoid mismanagement of funds. All 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC applications and budgets/budget revisions would have to be approved by the US Department of Education, and all questions/requests for technical assistance would have to be directed to the U.S. Department of Education. To send and receive information through the U.S. Department of Education would result in major delays in services and funding for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantees, and thus delay services to Utah students and their families.
- Migrant Education Program: Title I, Part C grantees would be responsible to hire outside agencies to provide professional development; conduct comprehensive needs assessments, service delivery plans and evaluations; conduct onsite monitoring; prepare monitoring reports; provide technical assistance; monitor reimbursement requests before sending them to the U.S. Department of Education for approval to avoid mismanagement of funds. All Migrant Education applications, budgets, and subsequent revisions would have to be approved by the US Department of Education, and all questions and requests for technical assistance would have to be directed to the U.S. Department of Education. To send and receive information through the U.S. Department of Education would result in major delays in services and funding for Migrant Education grantees, and thus delay services to Utah students and their families. Title I, Part C; Section 9302 of Title IX; Section 421(b) of GEPA and 34 CFR 76.700 – 76.783 and 80.3 delineate that only an SEA may receive a MEP grant from the Department. LEAs, other public agencies, and private nonprofit organizations, including institutions of higher education, may only participate in the program through sub-grants or contracts with SEAs.
- McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program: Title VII, Part B grantees would be responsible to hire outside agencies to provide professional development; conduct comprehensive needs assessments, service delivery plans and evaluations; conduct onsite monitoring; prepare monitoring reports; provide technical assistance; monitor reimbursement requests before sending them to the U.S. Department of Education for approval to avoid mismanagement of funds. All McKinney-Vento Homeless Education applications and budgets/budget revisions would have to be approved by the US Department of Education, and all questions/requests for technical assistance would have to be directed to the U.S. Department of Education. To send and receive information through the U.S. Department of Education would result in major delays in services and funding for McKinney-Vento Homeless Education grantees, and thus delay services to Utah students and their families.

- **Federal Grants Management:** Grant recipients must implement internal controls to minimize the cost of the use of money to the U.S. Government. These controls include: accounting and administrative controls from an outside agency/organization/CPA firm, and provides reasonable assurance that all Federal assets, including funds, are safeguarded against waste, loss, unauthorized use, or misappropriation. While the need for internal controls may seem burdensome or restrictive, their value should be obvious. The Federal Financial Management Requirements would not be followed if the LEAs and CBOs were to receive the federal grants directly, since any LEA disbursement is in the reimbursement basis. For this reason each outside agency/organization/CPA firm would essentially have to meet all SEA requirements, with the commitment to follow and provide the internal control and assurances required to manage Federal Funds.
- **Title III Compliance Requirements:** Grantees would be responsible to hire outside agencies to provide professional development; conduct comprehensive needs assessments, service delivery plans and evaluations; conduct onsite monitoring; prepare monitoring reports; provide technical assistance; monitor reimbursement requests before sending them to the U.S. Department of Education for approval to avoid mismanagement of funds. All LEA Plan and funding applications, budgets, and subsequent revisions would have to be approved by the US Department of Education, and all questions and requests for technical assistance would have to be directed to the U.S. Department of Education. To send and receive information through the U.S. Department of Education would result in major delays in services and funding for Title III, Part A, and Title III, Immigrant grantees, and thus delay services to Utah students and their families. 34 CFR 76.700 – 76.783 and 80.3 delineate that only an SEA may receive a Title III, Part A grant from the Department. Local educational agencies (LEAs), other public agencies, and private nonprofit organizations, including institutions of higher education, may only participate in the program through sub-grants or contracts with SEAs.
- **Title VII – Indian Education:** LEAs would be required to secure the necessary academic support, support from the community, and support from Utah Indian Tribes and the Higher Education programs. The professional staff at the schools, school districts, and agencies in Utah will not receive the updated information currently provided by SEA staff. A third party consultant would need be contracted to exercise all functions of the Title VII program.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

If the Federal and Special Programs section of the USOE were to be eliminated, the state savings would be minimal. Almost all of the section personnel costs of \$2,223,576 come from the mandated federal set-aside for state administration of federal programs. Approximately 75% of the section’s administrative costs are from federal funding sources. If LEAs were to hire additional staff or contract with third-party providers to fulfill the same required functions that the SEA provides, the costs to LEAs would exceed the proportional amount of additional administrative funds that they would receive in federal grants.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

In reviewing the roles and responsibilities of the staff in the Federal and Special Programs section, all job descriptions and individual work assignments align with federal education program requirements. The USOE does not believe that the section could reduce program or system functions without putting federal education funds at risk.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not Performed:***

In reviewing the roles and responsibilities of the staff in the Federal and Special Programs section, all job descriptions and individual work assignments align with federal education program requirements. The USOE does not believe that the section could reduce program or system functions without putting federal education funds at risk.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The enduring benefit of having a better prepared populace in terms of literacy, numeracy, and high school graduation impacts both the general economy and the individual opportunities and livelihood for generations. Students who historically have been underperforming can meet rigorous standards and access college and career opportunities that reduce unemployment and increase personal income. The state and federal investments of approximately \$130 million and the \$2.2 million that the USOE utilizes to support local education agencies provide a high return on investment (for every \$1 spent on administration, LEAs receive nearly \$70 in funding for student services); more students achieve literacy, graduate from high school, and go on to college. Additionally, far fewer youth end up in the corrections system as a result of successful education programs; saving the State of Utah significant financial resources.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Fine Arts and POPS**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

**Professional Outreach Programs in the Schools/Arts Subsidy**—this program provides professional arts experiences for all of Utah school children over a three year rotation. Participating professional organizations are: Shakespeare Festival, Utah Opera, Utah Symphony, Ballet West, Repertory Dance Theatre, Tanner Dance/Children’s Dance Theatre, Ririe-Woodbury Dance Company, Springville Museum of Art, Utah Museum of Fine Art, Utah Festival Opera and ARTS, Inc.

**Fine Arts Endorsements** ensures the highly qualified status of teachers in the areas of music, theatre, dance and visual arts.

**Fine Arts Core Standards** ensures high standards for learning in the fine arts.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

All of these functions are regulated by State Code and/or Board Rule.

R277-700 Core Standards

- Ensure high quality curriculum and instruction in the arts in Utah’s schools
- Comply arts as NCLB core subjects

R277-520 Teacher Licensure and Endorsements

- Ensure highly qualified arts teachers in Utah’s schools

R277-444 Professional Outreach Program in the Schools (POPS)

- Report annually to legislature
- Ensure fidelity to the use of legislative funds

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Professional Outreach Programs in the Schools is reported on a yearly basis to the State Board of Education as well as the education committee of the state legislature.

Fine Arts Endorsements are part of the Federal NCLB reporting requirements of highly qualified

teachers. It is also part of the Board’s commitment to “provide high quality instruction for all Utah Children.”

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

POPS/Arts Subsidy:

- Ensure fidelity to the use of legislative funds by participating organizations
- Ensure compliance with implementation requirements
- Ensure compliance with re-designation procedures
- Coordinate accessibility for all Utah children
- Ensure appropriate programming with relevance to state core standards
- Collaborate with combined organizations for sustainability and consistency

Fine Arts Endorsement:

- Ensures highly qualified arts teachers in schools
- Provide consistent expectations for endorsement requirements
- Respond to changes needed in requirements through collaboration with districts/schools
- Provide professional development opportunities for teachers seeking endorsements
- Collaborate with higher education in endorsement requirements and course offerings
- Increase the capacity of elementary classroom teachers to deliver quality arts instruction through Level 1 endorsement program

Fine Arts Core Standards:

- Develop fine arts core standards consistent with current national trends
- Align fine arts core standards with college and career ready standards
- Provide consistent standards in the arts for all Utah children
- Respond to changes needed with implementation of technology in the field

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 33,313.02
• Federal Funds	
• State Appropriation Funds	
• Total Funding	\$33,313.02

**Section Costs**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> <li>• Total Costs</li> </ul>	<p>\$27,418.91</p> <p>\$ 1,210.89</p> <p>\$ 3,509.62</p> <p>\$ 1,173.60</p> <p>\$33,313.02</p>
--	--

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

If the section were not to provide the above noted functions, each LEA would develop fine arts core standards and teaching qualifications on their own. The arts core standards and endorsements help to ensure the civic compact described in the constitutions and defined in the Board Mission of “Providing high quality instruction for all Utah Children” and “Establishing curriculum with high standards and relevance for all Utah Children.”

USOE coordinates the efforts of the POPS organizations giving Utah Children exposure to the magic of the ballet, opera, symphony, theatre, or visual works of work produced and performed by professionals. Code requires the POPS organizations to reach each school and district in a three year rotation. USOE reporting ensures equal access to the programs.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

System savings from the section functions equal the amount required for each LEA and/or school to develop and implement fine arts core standards and endorsement programs. There is definite economy of scale in having this function at the USOE level.

The fiscal cost for individual to perform the functions of this position could be calculated by considering the cost of turning the oversight of each element of this position by each LEA in the state (42 districts, including the Utah School for the Deaf and Blind, and 94 Charter Schools). An approximation of the cost when calculated using an average hourly rate of \$40/hour x # hours x the number of LEAs (136 or as indicated) to determine the cost of turning the oversight over to them instead of using an efficiency of scale model.

- Endorsements: review and determine compliance. Includes reviewing requirements, coordinating with universities and providers to ensure all curriculum and syllabi are appropriate, aligned with current research, and equitable through all systems. All LEAs have Fine Arts endorsements (Dance, Music Theatre and Visual Art) some time and would therefore need to continually update and review the endorsement.  
3 hours x 136 LEAs x \$40/hour = **\$16,320**
- Development of core standards:  
136 LEAs X 80 hours X \$40 X 4 Art Disciplines = \$1,720,800
- POPS Coordination and reporting:  
136 LEAs X 10 hours X \$40 = \$54,400

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

Fine Arts Endorsements/Core Standards:

Title IIA of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires teachers to be properly endorsed for their content area. Schools and districts would lose federal funding as well as pro staff costs if teachers are not properly endorsed. State funding for pro staff cost would be around \$1,300 per teacher as well as thousands in federal funds.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

Core Standards	\$1,720,800
Endorsements	\$ 16,320
Cost avoidance	\$ 50,000
POPS Coordination	\$ 54,400
STATEWIDE TOTAL	\$1,841,520

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

The work of Teaching and Learning allows LEAS to focus on working with students and teachers, rather than using their finite resources to duplicate work that can be in an economy of scale. The section is efficient and has ongoing contact with all LEAs and program providers allowing for frequent and timely responses to LEA needs.

The following is a one-page report of the POPS organizations. Their full reports are available upon request:

“Professional Outreach Programs in the Schools (POPS) is a consortium of 10 professional arts organizations in Utah. POPS has an ongoing partnership with Utah Public Schools, Utah State Office of Education, and the Utah State Legislature to provide critical arts learning experiences to Utah’s students and teachers. **We enhance student learning and teacher effectiveness, and align our programs with the Utah State Core Standards to provide experiences with professional artists through innovative, interactive arts education programs.**

“Specific criteria are required of each organization within the POPS group. **Organizations must have a statewide programming plan, must match funding from the legislature by a minimum 1:1 ratio, represent a professional model of excellence, be accountable to the State Office of Education through annual reports, and be accountable to each other through a peer evaluation process.**

“Each of the organizations engaged in the POPS groups has repeatedly demonstrated excellence in each of these categories. **Each discipline offers programs to every school district in the state**

**on a 3-year rotational system** and leverages the funds from the legislature with private, corporate, individual and foundation support, often in excess of the 1:1 ratio required. We are each using and/or creating nationally recognized and accredited arts education programs executed by professional and certified educators and performers. We meet with the State Office of Education quarterly to ensure streamlined and efficient scheduling and documentation practices. Prior to the beginning of each school year we work collectively to create a peer evaluation schedule to ensure diverse and enriched art experiences as well as educational soundness.

“In addition to **peer evaluations**, each organization is required, as a component of its annual report to the State Office of Education, to engage in and report on self-evaluations. This component is broken down into categories of **Cost-Effectiveness, Procedural Efficiency, Collaborative Practices, Educational Soundness, Professional Excellence, and Goals/Plans for continued Evaluation and Improvement**. This reporting practice encourages us to not only strive for best practices but also for the flexibility to remain current and effective.”

Total Students Reached 2012-2013	428,752
Total Teachers Reached 2012-2013	22,890
Instructional Hours 2012-2013	14,807

Benefit-Cost: 54

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Health and Physical Education**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Health and Physical Education Program provides support and leadership for K-12 students through planning, cooperation, and professional development for 136 districts. The program provides schools with guidelines that support mental, social, and physical well-being, state-wide training for school personnel, parents, and other state agencies. This program coordinates with colleges, universities and other educational institutions to improve the pre-service and in-service education for teachers. The Health and Physical Education specialist provides oversight for implementation and compliance of the program.

Health and Physical Education includes the following primary areas of focus:

**Integration of Physical Activity and Health** into core subject areas in order to improve academic, social, emotional, and behavior in elementary schools.

**Peer Planning** to work together in designing lessons that integrate activity with other subject lessons.

**Professional Development** designed to promote increased activity and healthy behaviors in K-12 students.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code 53a-1-302. Implementation is governed by the following Board Rules: Board Rules on Licensing R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520; Utah Code on Licensing 53A-6; Board Rules on Instructional materials R277-269

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Ensure that all educators working with students are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Act as a liaison with state health groups
- Ensure completion of performance plans and reports
- Oversee professional development
- Accept and process teacher endorsements
- Provide professional development for LEA leaders

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to complete an annual report to the legislature and to provide additional reports and information upon request. The annual report includes:

- State: Yearly LEA report on status of human sexuality instruction
- Federal: Bi-annual *School Health Profiles Survey*

- Federal: Bi-annual *State Level School Health Policies and Practices*

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

- Develop and periodically revise core standards to guide health and physical education instruction
- Provide free and inexpensive professional development opportunities for health and physical educators
- Provide state-required sex education law and policy trainings
- Develop teaching and assessment resources for the state’s educators
- Review transcripts, develop State Approved Endorsement Plans, and track progress of candidates seeking endorsements in health and physical education
- Develop Board Rule and supporting resources for implementation of new law
- Foster relationships with higher education and community health agencies to enhance health and physical education instruction
- Chair health-related committees
- Participate as a member of health-related committees
- Be available to respond to questions in person, on the telephone and through email
- Present current content information to teachers, parents, administrators and legislators

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$
• State Appropriation Funds	\$ 124,887.93
Total Funding	<u>\$124,887.93</u>

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$104,800.47
• Travel Expenses	\$ 2,617.00
• Current Expenses	\$ 4,056.00 (Rent ,Phone)
• Other Charges	\$ 13,414.46 (Indirect Cost)
Total Costs	<u>\$124,887.93</u>

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Failure of the section to provide services to LEAs would result in failure of USOE to oversee and insure quality certification of teachers, lack of updated health and physical education resources and updates, teachers unfamiliar with state law and policy for human sexuality, lack of guidelines from state core standards. The loss of program would result in diminished health and wellness of our children.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

By virtue of the Health and Physical Education specialist providing professional development, training in human sexuality law and policy, courses for health and physical education endorsements, providing materials and teaching resources, LEAs receive significant cost savings including:

- Professional development (\$60,950.00)

- Human Sexuality Law and Policy (\$7,000.00)
- Summer Endorsement courses for Health and Physical Education (\$40,000.00)
- Materials for implementation(\$10,000)
- Pilot Study for Physical Activity and Academic Success (\$15,000.00)

***Estimated Program or Systems Cost Avoidance From Section Functions:***

LEAs can avoid potential lawsuits for student injuries sustained due to unsafe environments, improperly trained personnel, outdated curriculum or improper supervision: \$100,000.00- \$500,000.00 per incident (estimate). Following State Law and Policy can avoid potential lawsuits due to inappropriate information and behaviors in human sexuality instruction: \$100,000.00 per incident (estimate). The work of the section ensures integrity and understanding of implementation of school policy and curricula.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

Avoidance of law suits, providing teachers with current policy and laws, and endorsement courses are potentially millions as indicated above.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The work of this section allows LEA's to focus on working with students and teachers, rather than using their resources for program responsibilities. This has allowed USOE to help build a strong support system for physical education and health for K-12 students. This section is supportive if all LEA programs and responds to LEA needs for schools.

Total State Expenditures (State funds and section costs): \$124,887.93

Estimated alternative service costs: \$359,500

Estimated Cost Avoidance: \$2,000,000

Net Benefit of position to state: \$2,234,612

Benefit-Cost: 17.9

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Information Technology**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Information Technology Section at the Utah State Office of Education provides applications, support and network infrastructure to the USOE. IT collects data for and computes innumerable student, educator and school statistics including state and federal accountability reports. IT is directly or indirectly involved in all technology and data activity throughout the USOE. The IT section also provides the entire Web presence, network infrastructure and internet access for all the USOE sections and the state Superintendent.

The Utah State Office of Education Information Technology section develops, maintains and supports the following applications:

**Accountability applications –**

AYP, U-PASS, UCAS, Appeals app, AMAO Title III  
Assessment system

**Program applications –**

CACTUS – Teacher licensing  
PATI – Program Approval – CTE  
SSID – Statewide Student ID  
RIMS – Instructional Materials

**LEA applications –**

Aspire – Student Information System

**Financial applications –**

BASE, C8 – Accounting  
Transportation – School bus information  
APR & AFR – Annual Program & Annual Financial Reports  
UPEFS – New collection for APR & AFR  
Warehouse – Feed into financial calculations as well as Superintendent’s Annual

Report

YEWS – Year-End Web Survey  
MSP – Minimum School Program

**Federal reporting –**

EdFacts / EDEN application – Federal data warehouse  
TEDI – Special Ed Program C to B transition  
Web applications and reports that fulfill state and federal requirements  
Perkins

**USOR –**

IRIS – Integrated Rehabilitation Information System

**USOE –**

Website  
UTREx – Student data collection infrastructure  
Data Warehouse – UTREx data matched to assessment, College Board, higher ed, etc.  
Network infrastructure and security

All activities of this section are directly linked back to state and federal requirements, such as:  
State legislation:

- 53A-1 – Administration of Public Education at the State Level
- 53A-3 – Local School Boards (Accountability Reports)
- 53A-6 – Educator Licensing and Professional Practices Act (CACTUS, Online Renewals, University Recommends, TrueNorth Logic)
- 53A-11 – Students in Public Schools (UTREx infrastructure)
- 53A-14 – State Instructional Materials Commission (RIMS – Instructional Materials)
- 53A-17a – Minimum School Program Act (UTREx)
- 53A-24 – State Office of Rehabilitation Act (IRIS, BLISS, etc.)

Federal legislation:

- ESEA Sections: 1111(b)(2)(E-H); 1116(b)(c); 6213(b); 6224(e); 1114(a)(1); 1003(a); 1117(c)(2)(A); 2141; 6123; 1003(g); 4201(b)(1)(A); and 4204(b)(2)(A) – No Child Left Behind accountability reporting, EdFacts (electronic federal extracts/reports - some 100+ files)
- PL 107-110, The Elementary and Secondary Act, Part A, Subpart 1, SEC. 1111. STATE PLANS. (h) REPORTS. (C) REQUIRED INFORMATION – UTREx incident data
- Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006, Section 113 Accountability (b)(4)(C): categories of students described in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 – UTREx & PATI

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Collecting and reporting state and federal data

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

All state and federal reports that require student and/or teacher data are performed by the IT section.

- Accountability reporting
- Financial reporting
- Student achievement reporting

***Benefits Provided by the Program or Section:***

The work of the information Technology section benefits not only the USOE, but also LEAs. Semi-annual data conferences are held along with monthly meetings with districts and charter schools. Some of the more important benefits are:

- Network and Data Security
- Support for all applications and technology used at the USOE & USOR

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

• State Education Funds	\$ 2,670,695.00
• Federal Funds	\$ 4,156,717.00
• Other (Describe): Indirect Cost	\$ 1,875,837.00
One time FIS	347,351.00
Total Funding	<hr/> \$ 9,050,500.00

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 4,606,443.00
• Travel Expenses	\$ 10,685.00
• Current Expenses	\$ 652,184.00
• Other Charges – Capital Outlays	\$ 129,739.00
Indirect Costs	\$ 359,436.00
Flow Thru	\$ 3,292,013.00
Facilities Construction	\$ 0.00
Total Costs	<hr/> \$ 9,050,500.00

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- Many of the sections and programs would not be able to perform their duties and functions without the support of IT.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

- Average contractor salaries for developers in the current market - \$137.50/hr. Average USOE developer salary - \$42.70/hr. (including benefits). Savings of \$94.79/hr./developer. Currently, we have 20+ developers making the annual savings approximately \$3,943,246 on developers alone.
- Average contractor salaries for support personnel in the current market - \$85/hr. Average USOE support salary - \$38.82/hr. (including benefits). Savings of \$46.18/hr./developer. Currently, we have 10+ support personnel making the annual savings approximately \$960,544.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

- LEAs spend millions of dollars every year on student information systems. They are able to use the Aspire application at no cost to the LEA.
- IT provides a significant amount of help to districts and charters on how to most efficiently report the information required to the USOE. This allows them to rely on the USOE instead of hiring this expertise at the local level.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

- Alternative costs are listed above as contractors would be required to perform the tasks now performed by IT.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

- The IT section is an essential section in the state office as well as being an integral part of the LEAs' data and reporting needs. This section allows the LEAs to focus on the data driven decision making process for how to improve teaching methods based on student performance. The IT section also allows the other sections and programs within the USOE to focus on their tasks without worrying about security, data storage needs, internet access, etc.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Instructional Materials Review**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Utah State Instructional Materials Commission was created by the legislature in 1907, to function as a group of appointed educators and lay citizens who would ensure that Utah's schools have the best available instructional materials, and to eliminate inferior or undesirable materials.

The Instructional Materials Commission was placed under the direction of the State Board of Education in 1987. The Board has charged the Commission with determining what instructional materials should be recommended for use in the public elementary and secondary schools. It is the Commission's duty to oversee the review of all submitted instructional materials. Such materials should implement the aims, purposes, and objectives of the appropriate courses of study, as determined by the State Board. Through the Instructional Materials Center at USOE, curriculum advisory committees are appointed to assist in this effort, with help from the content area specialists at the State Office of Education. The advisory committees are made up of master teachers from around the state who come together to review, in a team setting, the submitted materials. The curriculum content specialist and his assistant, administer and perform executive functions for the Commission to see that the entire review process is smooth and seamless.

The 11 member Commission meets twice a year to make final recommendations to the State Board of Education on the most recently reviewed materials. After sending final recommendations to the State Board, the Commission posts the instructional material evaluations on the Internet where they can be accessed by districts, teachers and parents. At that point begins a new instructional material adoption cycle, which culminates at the end of the next six-month period in final recommendations of new materials to the State Board.

**References:**

Utah Code: Title 53A-14 State Instructional Materials Commission  
Utah Administrative Code, Rule R277-469 Instructional Materials Commission Operating Procedures

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Section 53A-14-102 specifies that the State Board of Education will recommend materials for use in the public schools. Items recommended are listed for 5 years. Items may be removed from the list if they are deemed unsatisfactory. Schools have discretion to select materials it deems appropriate for instruction.

The rest of section 53A-14 outlines procedures for bidding and contractual arrangements. It also requires that materials that are "recommended primary" must be accompanied by alignments that show locations of parts of the curriculum to the core.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Reports are prepared for the Utah State Board of Education in June and December of each year, listing the materials reviewed and the accompanying recommendations for each. The reviews are then posted on the public website at <http://delleat.schools.utah.gov/rims/index.html>

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

All 1072 public schools in Utah can access the online database through the site listed above. There are currently 4404 reviewed titles in the Recommended Instructional Materials Search (RIMS) database. 151 teachers and curriculum specialists participated in last year’s reviews, with an average of 800 hours of work per review cycle (semi-annual). There are 359 publishers registered in our database, and the average participation in a given review is about 35. In the fiscal year 2013, entries for reviewed titles totaled 1350.

The collaborative action of the reviewers, together with the supervision of the Instructional Materials Commission benefits schools in Utah by performing a cost effective service that saves them time, energy, and resources, while providing them with a reliable and useful tool to begin the process of selecting instructional materials. Reviews are conducted at least annually for every curriculum area, insuring that publishers have the opportunity to provide the most current educational materials. It is widely used and accepted, as evidenced by over 60,000 hits for FY2013 on the website for the USOE instructional materials center at <http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/imc> . In 2012, Alpine school district ordered over 36,000 instructional items (including student texts, teacher editions, digital and online resources, and numerous ancillary materials) from publishers, totaling nearly \$2,000,000.

The number and variety of curriculum materials created for use in the schools is expanding exponentially. A great number of them are now digital, and are designed for use on electronic devices used by students. Connections have been made with hundreds of publishers through the well-established review process that have provided access to a great wealth of these materials. Many districts in the state require that items be selected from our list of recommended materials, which encourages publishers to submit samples and go through the review process. The reviews encompass all type of materials that are designed as courseware and that meet state core standards and objectives.

The curriculum content specialist in instructional materials is currently serving as president of the State Instructional Materials Review Association, a collaborative organization of representatives from 22 states. Utah plays a significant role in contributing and sharing information about the criteria and elements leading to best practices in the review of instructional materials.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$129,145
• Federal Funds	\$
• Other (Describe):	\$
Total Funding	<hr/> \$129,681 (FY 2013)

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> </ul>	\$100,995 \$ 500 \$ 2,331 \$ 25,855
Total Costs	\$ 129,681 (FY2013)

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

Each school or district would have to organize its own review process with all the attendant steps, including: (1) notification to publishers of upcoming reviews, (2) receiving “intent to bid” and bid forms, (3) receiving and organizing sufficient samples and alignments to allow for multiple reviewers to evaluate the materials, (4) making contractual arrangements with publishers, (5) holding evaluation meetings with qualified, organized review teams for all affected subject areas, (6) organizing quality control groups to oversee the process, (7) arranging for local administrative approval of selected materials, (8) posting listed reviews and processes to a publicly accessible database, (9) arranging for appeals of reviews from publishers, (10) registering NIMAS files with NIMAC.

Without the state serving as a central facilitator for this work, there would also be no representation in national collaborative organizations, notably the State Instructional Materials Review Association (SIMRA). Connection with this organization has saved USOE time and resources through the sharing of information from other states.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

The review of instructional materials at USOE saves districts and schools considerable time in the curriculum selection and adoption process. Arrangements are made from a single location with publishers as well as district review personnel to coordinate the reviews. Reviewers are brought in from various grade levels, subject, and geographical areas to insure that different points of view are represented. Some districts in the state are not equipped to do this on their own. District technology resources are saved through the use of a centrally located, current, and universally accessible database. Personnel at USOE maintain the resources and coordinate all of the events pertaining to the review, with minimal burdens placed on local districts.

Publishers are saved time and expense by providing resources to a single location rather than for each district or school in the state.

Teachers and students are saved time by being able to access reviews of preselected materials that are compared and aligned to core objectives and rated to assist in academic achievement.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

If districts and charter schools had to do this process without the collaborative meetings organized at USOE, the review steps would be repeated 136 times. Additionally each would need to accommodate numerous interactions with publishers that occur on a daily basis, and set up procedures to accomplish the reviews through a clearly defined process.

The information under “Summary of Costs and Benefits” listed below describes the amount of time and

the expense expended by the State Office of Education in organizing and executing the reviews. Districts and schools avoid spending similar amounts of time on the process by utilizing the service offered through the Instructional Materials Center.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

If the USOE instructional materials reviews were not performed, schools and districts would have to arrive at their own selection process, unless they decided not to have a selection process and left it to the teachers themselves to determine what curriculum materials they would use. This would place an enormous burden on teachers to find and validate such resources, especially in the age when much is available in a digital format, and there are resources available from many less than reputable sources. Although the state process is not comprehensive, it does involve the major publishers in the industry, and it provides guidelines that can be used in selection. It provides a clearing house that all publishers can participate in to provide educators with vetted materials. Without this process, districts and schools would be much more liable in the face of complaints regarding curriculum.

If the reviews were conducted by a private agency, there would likely be the loss of neutrality or an unbiased point of view. A business would be interested in profit and their reviews would likely reflect that. It would be very difficult for a private business to maintain contacts with all the independent publishers. The business would also need to have close contact with schools to secure all the information relating to core standards, and would likely need to hire educators who are resident experts in the curricular areas considered. The costs of hiring personnel, arranging for locations to store samples, making meeting arrangements at a rented location, developing an online database, and the other items listed in the Implications box would result in much higher costs to conduct the review than what is currently accomplished at the State Office of Education.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

In Fiscal year 2013, the total cost of the review process from the Utah State Office of Education was calculated at \$129,681. Reviewers (151) participated in the evaluation sessions and averaged 5 hours each, for a total of 755 hours spent examining materials. The Curriculum Content Specialist and the Office Assistant combined for 2188 hours spent relating to the review process. The total number of hours accumulated in the Instructional Materials Review then totals 2,943, breaking down the cost per hour of the review process to \$44.06. This results in a \$29.44 cost per review item posted in the RIMs database for 2013. Each item is generally evaluated by 3 reviewers, which would mean the cost per reviewer would be \$9.81 (average review time per series, including several items, per reviewer is about one hour). The reviews are available to all 1094 schools in the state. A conservative estimate of the benefit per year, not including lawsuits, would be 3 volunteers multiplied by 4 hours per month at \$10 per hour, resulting at a cost for each LEA of \$181,440. The benefit ratio per district would then be 181,440/129,681, but would obviously be much, much more when you consider that there are 41 districts plus charter schools, or a total of 136 LEAs in the state.

The main benefit to educational patrons in Utah is a database of recommended materials that ensure that Utah's schools have the best available instructional materials, with inferior or undesirable materials eliminated. Schools and districts can rely on the recommendations for the selection of appropriate, core-aligned materials for instruction. It is an established process that has served Utah education well in the past and continues to adapt to new advances in technology that are producing a flood of resources for instruction.

Benefit-Cost: Approximately 59

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Internal Accounting**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Maintains and provides accounting functions as generally required by any organization. Track approximately 100 sources of funding and the disposition of each funding source with detailed accounting codes. Properly charge to each funding source and cost code to ensure compliance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and federal regulations. Create ad hoc reports using accumulated information as needed for the Board, management or other agencies.

Collect and deposit cash receipts into proper bank accounts, including federal cash receipts from federal grants, reconcile bank accounts, reconcile internal accounting systems required for Rehabilitation payments and Minimum School reporting. Process all payments and transactions including any corrections to transactions, payments to employees for travel or other reimbursable expenses, posting or allocating costs from ISFs in the state, motor pool allocations, payments for general services, allocation of rent costs, liability insurance, and payment for client services.

Process monthly payments for transfer of funds to each of 125 Local Education Agencies (LEA) in Utah, batch all payments federal and state, and oversee transfer through Treasurer's office and FINET. Provide report for each LEA receiving funds so they can properly record amounts transferred. Also provide other reports for LEAs as needed annually for audit purposes and for their reconciliations.

Work with programmers to maintain an internal accounting system, Budget Accounting System for Education (BASE), which provides functionality not available in FINET. BASE allows employees of the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and Utah State Office of Rehabilitation (USOR). Maintain a budget system for all divisions to the object level for each source of funding.

Maintains data for all grant awards. Maintain data for awards to LEAs or third parties and changes to awards; report all federal grant awards in USOE and Child Nutrition Program (CNP) to Federal Funds Accountability Transparency Act (FFATA) database maintained by the Federal Government.

Process and account for all payments for the Revolving Loan Fund for School Districts and Charter Schools. This includes the correct posting of interest and principle for each loan.

Annually provide to State Finance a Payment Card Institute (PCI) assessment. The PCI assessment is required to accept electronic payment cards for to help reduce risk of theft.

Provides travel arrangements for USOE\USOR employees as well as teacher trainers and for other persons assisting with developing educational materials for the schools. Provide travel arrangements for council members for Rehabilitation councils as needed.

Follow State Procurement Code and other provisions of the Utah Code in performing all purchasing duties. We use the State Purchasing MA10 agency contract expiration report to assist with our expiring contracts. We use it to query our database and add additional information. Our automated report

generates e-mails at predetermined times (30, 60, 90, 120 days) depending on the importance of the contract and the performance history of the contract monitor. These e-mail reminders can be sent to the monitor to determine what action must be taken, and keep track of when the reminder went out, what reply came back if any, what it said, if action has been taken or not and keep sending if necessary so contracts don't slip through the cracks.

Purchase goods and services for all divisions in USOE, USOR and CNP. Comply with state and federal purchasing regulations, review requests for proposals, determine best method of procurement, comply with standing State purchasing contracts, make contract payments, review contract payments, receive and direct goods delivered to main office building. Resolve issues and contract disputes with vendors. Advise employees on proper purchasing procedures. Advise employees on proper and most cost effective purchasing procedures.

Act as agency Purchasing Card Coordinator. Review Purchasing Card Procedures Checklist with new applicants. Review monthly statements approve transfer for payment of goods or services. Uses Purchasing Card to make internet purchases, register for conferences or other purchases for the agency when the vendor won't take a warrant.

Responsible for timely, accurate and efficient dispersal of all incoming USOE/USOR mail. Contacts employees directly to inform of priority shipment arrivals and location for pick up. Records all incoming visible checks into accounting log. Notifies concerned parties regarding address errors issues. Provides customer service by giving guidance, answering questions via e-mail, voice mail and service counter. Advises on correct parcel packaging and preparation and best choice of service due to the shipping of time sensitive materials. Provides price and type of service cost quote comparisons. Published and updates as necessary, mailing guidelines of all rules and procedures required to comply with USPS regulated rules and cost effective mailing strategies facilitated through state mail for final processing. This document aids in the cross training of new support staff employees. Maintains a detailed alphabetical internal mail routing directory of all current and former agency employees and corresponding mail box by physical building locations. Updates an alphabetical internal employee phone number roster, alphabetical listing of agency internal departments, programs and related acronyms. Promptly notifies all agency staff of any immediate changes required by state mail that directly impact their work. Orders, stocks and maintains adequate inventory of all necessary postal supplies. Tracks and performs all final processes for monthly billing of postage due fees.

Manage all functions of shipping and receiving goods for agency. Inspect all incoming shipments for visible box damages. Secures all shipped and received parcels of testing materials, computer and related items and high value shipments until picked up by receiving customer or shipping vendor. Consults customer on additional features available such as declared value insurance and restricted signature or special addressing requirements. Prepare necessary packaging, weighs and processes all outgoing US and international Federal Express shipments. Monitor all package processes through distinct tracking numbers. Maintains Federal Express account and prepares all invoices for payment with vendor. Tracks and sorts all final charges and credits due by preparing final month end billing to all internal agency account cost codes. Trouble shoots all billing errors. Orders, stocks and maintains adequate inventory of all necessary federal express supplies.

Handles all receiving of internal office supply orders from Office Depot, Staples and Office Max. Sorts and cross references orders to purchase order numbers. Verifies order totals are correct. Inspects orders for damages, shortages or errors. Promptly contacts employees directly to inform of office supply shipment arrivals and location for pick up. Monitors all back orders and product cancellations and notifies customer of order status updates. Contacts and reports directly to office supply vendors

customer service department and arranges for all product credits, returns, replacements and/or discrepancies. Serves as an advocate on behalf of customer to resolve product availability and deadline issues and arrange credits of "non-refundable" special order conflicts directly with vendor account managers. Submits all billing and credit invoicing to internal accounting department for final processing in a timely manner.

Collect mail for state mail processing, maintain systems for UPS and Fed Ex and handle their incoming and outgoing packages. Allocate these costs to the divisions. Oversee 3 Industrial copiers and allocate costs, arrange for maintenance and renewal, coordinate with state printing on all print jobs and assure that all print jobs meet proof reading standards for the agency. Direct print jobs to UCI or outside vendors when state printing is unable to provide needed services.

Provides Accounting and Federal Financial Reporting services for USOR. This includes processing payments to vendors for direct services to clients. USOR serves over 30,000 Clients annually. We process as many as 4,000 transactions per month for these services. As well as the DDS who serve over 22,000 claimants annually, this requires processing an addition 2,000 transactions monthly.

Process accounts payable transactions for administrative costs, employee travel, current expenses, payroll, etc., for USOR. Internal Accounting monitors the transactions to ensure proper procurement policies and procedures are followed. Reconcile expenditures for clients between FINET, and our client information systems, IRIS for USOR and BASE for Disability Determination Services (DDS). We have many commercial merchant accounts that require reconciliation monthly as well. Monitor USOR budgets and appropriations.

Fulfill reporting requirements for various federal grants. Ensure state funds matching requirements are met. Provide assurance that funds from federal grants are used in accordance with federal guidelines, policies and within the time frame given to expend those funds.

Provide financial information to USOR administration to facilitate decision making. Reports completed by Internal Accounting for the DDS include but not limited to: a Monthly Obligation Report that shows expenditures and obligations, also quarterly spending plans, quarterly expenditure reports (Social Security Administration (SSA)-4513), these are prepared by our section and submitted to the regional office of SSA in Denver Colorado, when due. Expense reports are prepared for interagency contracts so funds can be transferred between agencies according the contract provisions.

Prepare SF-425's for multiple grants which are submitted to The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) (section of US Department of Education). Preparation of RSA 2 annual report. Each grant has its own matching requirements which are also monitored. The expenditures for these grants are monitored to ensure they comply with the grant period and the grant purpose.

Close out and submit the financial reports for USOR each July and federal grants each October. We prepare information for budget prep every year including a list of all federal grants with expected expenditures, vacancy savings report, HB138 report (financial data and FTEs), fees and leases. Also provide data for legislative fiscal analysts and the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. Provide accounting and fiscal services to USOR and USOE Administrations.

Enters and maintains records on fixed assets in FINET, reviews and reconciles at least annually and notes disposal of assets at end of useful life as required to meet reporting requirements for the CAFR, federal grants if asset is purchased with federal funds and for providing controls against loss of property.

Advise on Internal Revenue Code §403(b) plan as needed. Reconcile 403(b) plan with Utah Retirement Systems for former employees to determine status for retirement.

BASE tracks the number of transactions processed. It is split out by Section or Loworg, Budget, Revenue, Encumbrance, Expenditure and summarized in the Total Documents column. For fiscal year 2012 we processed:

Budget Transactions	Revenue Transactions	Encumbrance Transactions	Expenditure Transactions	Total Documents\ Transactions
4,534	2,256	10,056	618,012	671,858

The Expenditure column resulted in a payment being issued by FINET to a vendor or transfer of funds to another State agency.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Federal OMB Circular A-133 Single Audit Reports.

Federal Receipts Reporting, H.B. 218 (2011 General Session)

Comply with Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations on Federal Funds.

Comply with IRS regulations related to employee reimbursements for travel, de-minimis items, 1099 vendor reporting requirements and payroll.

Comply with state regulations related to URS and funding.

Multitude of state statutes primarily dealing with the budget act and the section applying Board of Education.

Cash Management Improvement Act (CMIA) related to Federal Funds including cash draws from federal government on at least a weekly basis.

Purchasing regulations in both federal and state statutes. Advise on and comply with FINET requirements and State Accounting Guidelines. Comply with budget preparation requirements set out by GOPB and UCA §63J. Provide purchasing contracts for approval at Board Meetings. Maintain accounts in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and general accounting practices.

Follow Procurement Code rules & Utah Code regulations in performing all Purchasing duties such as; Small Purchases 63G-6-409, Purchase of prison industry goods 63G-6-423, Use of competitive sealed proposals in lieu of bids-Procedure 63G-6-408, Conditions for use of Sole Source Procurement R33-3-401.

Purchasing regulations in both federal statutes.

State and federal reporting requirements, per each grant requirement, as well as monitoring of expenditures to assure compliance with state and federal statutes.

Utah Code Annotated Title 53A Chapter 24.

Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Code of Federal Regulations Title 34 Part 80”

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Section reports yearly on operations to State for compilation of State CAFR, Indirect Cost Proposal, State Close Package, Budget Prep for GOPB.

Weekly reports for federal receipts. Daily reports on old year payments.

Reports to Department of Labor for time reporting for employees.

Ad hoc reports as requested by the Board, management and other state agencies.

Submit Limited Purchasing Delegation (LPD) reports as required by State Purchasing with the required information by the required date.

Assist the Department of Administrative Services with the requirements of HB138 (2011) reporting.

Federal Grant requirements from "Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) and Other Applicable Grant Regulations

Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Code of Federal Regulations Title 34 Part 80" and Rehabilitation Services requirements are monitored to assure compliance for single audit regulations. SSA- 4513, Monthly Obligation Report, Quarterly Spending Plan. SF-425's, RSA 2.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

Contributes to lower bonding costs by maintaining and assisting State Finance in compiling a State CAFR that maintains an unqualified opinion.

Provides data for auditors of LEAs to assist in CAFR and single audits for schools that provide unqualified opinions to lower their bonding costs.

Complies with many federal reporting requirements and cash management which are required to receive federal funding.

Completes indirect costs proposal which allows participation in federal grants to cover costs which reduces amount of state funding necessary to maintain the same level of programs.

Provides information to GOPB and LFA on budgets, revenues and expenditures detailing operations to account for \$3 billion in appropriations and collections.

Distributes the Minimum School Program to Local Education Agencies in a timely, accurate and compliant manner.

Assist sections with federal reporting requirements. Provide financial, budgetary consultations with different divisions to allow them to concentrate on program specific work.

Centralized purchasing allows this section to approve agency purchases in a consistent manner. These approvals are done with the professional knowledge of a purchasing professional with over 20 years of experience. This experience serves the agency well with the difficult and changing technical law, code, rules, templates and forms.

The purchasing agent in this agency has several Limited Purchasing Delegations (LPD) from the State

Division of Purchasing. These LPDs allow many purchases to be approved at this agency without having to send them to the State Division of Purchasing. This results in time and personnel cost savings.

Agency contract expiration dates are tracked. Critical and necessary contracts don't expire while they are still needed resulting in extra procurement work.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$
• Other (Describe): Indirect Cost Pool	\$ 1,203,650
Total Funding	<u>\$ 1,203,650</u>

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 971,500
• Travel Expenses	\$ 0
• Current Expenses	\$ 232,150
• Other Charges	\$
Total Costs	<u>\$ 1,203,400</u>

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

The functions of this section must be done. If the functions were not done the following could happen:

- Federal Funds would not be drawn down;
- Federal education, nutrition and vocational rehabilitation grants would be denied;
- Workers eligible for rehabilitation services would remain unemployed;
- Vendors would stop providing service to vocational rehabilitation clients;
- There would be little or control over federal spending at a state level;
- No accountability of how state and federal tax money is being spent;
- Purchasing statutes and guidelines would not be followed;
- Services and goods would be purchased at inflated prices;
- LEAs would not receive state or federal funding;
- Public schools would close;
- Public school children would not be educated;
- LEAs would default on their bond payments;
- Public schools would be foreclosed and sold;
- Assets and funds could be misappropriated due to lack of controls;
- The State's CAFR could have a qualified opinion which would affect costs for the state and LEAs when bonding;
- Uneducated children would lead to an increase in all social services;
- Uneducated children will lead to an exponential increase of costs in the juvenile and later adult justice systems.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Calculating the savings from our section functions is difficult. State Assistant Comptroller Marcie Handy was contacted to verify the Department of Administrative Services Division of Finance (DAS Finance) currently isn't staffed to handle the day to day accounting functions for this agency. Therefore at a minimum they would have to hire additional staffing to process the voluminous amount of transactions handled by the Internal Accounting Staff. Since DAS Finance cannot achieve savings through economies of scale the savings would either be a push or through our experience and automation of business services we could say it would, at least initially, take another entity an additional two FTE over the current.

For the other business services provided by Internal Accounting including, purchasing, mail room, copy, and travel it is difficult to quantify. If State Mail were to drop off the mail into a bin and each section were to come and pick through this bin it would not be as effective as having a centralized mail room. Also the potential for lost or stolen mail would increase. Teachers in the State of Utah mail in their fees for licensure as well as other funds come into this agency and are processed by Internal Accounting staff. This would have at best inconvenient or time lost consequences. Internal Accounting also services the copy machines throughout the building. This service allows sections to be billed appropriately for copy machine usage. Internal Accounting has a Purchasing Agent who assists the staff in all stages of the purchasing process. This expertise is a great resource and allows agency personnel to concentrate on their expertise without having to learn the intricacies of the Purchasing Code. We estimate having centralized business functions we are able to save the agency one additional FTE. This would be a savings on top of the funds each section contributes to the Indirect Cost Pool.

It is estimated three FTE are saved by having centralized accounting and business services. If an FTE is worth \$105,000 per year this would equate to a savings of \$315,000 per year.

Adhering to purchasing statutes and guidelines provided by the state Division of Purchasing saves this agency \$4,000,000 per year.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Performing purchasing services for this agency allows the agency to enter into contracts in a legal manner. If the expertise were not here it could lead to contracts being entered into illegally at worst and at best contracts wouldn't be entered into at the best possible value for the State. It could be reasoned in purchasing alone this section avoids thousands of dollars in personnel costs associated by litigation or RFP appeals costs alone. These services also allow the State to enter into contracts with vendors at the best possible value. The best value allows the State to save potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars. For this analysis it is estimated the savings to be \$300,000 to \$5,000,000 per year.

Having a centralized accounting system with proper internal controls reduces the potential for fraud. Without proper accounts payable controls fraud costs could be between \$50,000 and \$25,000,000 per year.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

If the functions of this section were not performed this agency would lose out on millions of dollars of federal grants. The functions must be performed in order to comply with state and federal regulations. The functions of this section are also required by both federal and state statutes. Therefore due to statutory requirements the functions of this section must be performed.

The alternative costs to perform these functions would be to send all functions up to DAS Finance, have the various sections do their own accounting or privatize all of the accounting functions. For DAS Finance to perform these functions they would need additional personnel. At best they would need to hire the same number of accountants Internal Accounting has along with additional Information Technology personnel to assist in processing 671,858 accounting documents or transactions. Due to the expertise acquired through many years of dedicated service by the employees of this section we have achieved certain economies of scale. Specifically the ability to process hundreds of thousands of payments and funds transfers efficiently. To have another group try to figure this all out while still maintaining current levels of production would be extremely difficult and not cost effective. Therefore the calculated alternative costs would be an additional 20 percent for the personnel and current expenses. Total alternative costs:

	2013 Expenditures	Estimated Alternative Costs
Personnel Costs	\$971,500	\$1,236,000
Current Expenses	\$233,150	\$306,480

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

<b>Section Costs</b>	<b>(\$1,203,650)</b>
<b>Benefits: Section Savings</b>	<b>\$4,315,000</b>
Cost Avoidance	<b>\$300,000 - \$50,000,000</b>
Alternative Costs	<b>\$1,542,480</b>
<b>Benefit of Section</b>	<b>\$4,872,080 - \$54,572,080</b>
<b>Benefit/Cost</b>	<b>3.8 – 42.5</b>

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

Section: **Internal Audit**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The *Utah Constitution* vests general control and supervision of the public education system in the State Board of Education. The Utah Internal Audit Act found in *Utah Code* 63I-5-201 establishes internal audit departments in various state agencies as well as the Utah State Office of Education (USOE), under the direction of the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education (the Board) established an internal audit division in R277-116, and charged the internal auditors to work in partnership with the Board and Board officers to assess risk and provide assurances that risks are mitigated and that the governance structure of the entire public education system is strong and effective.

The USOE Internal Audit Division assists the State Superintendent and the Audit Committee of the Board in effectively fulfilling their responsibilities associated with over \$3 billion of State and Federal funds which are expended in 131 individual Local Education Agencies (LEAs), the USOE, numerous non-profit organizations, the Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (USDB), and the Utah State Office of Rehabilitation (USOR).

Internal Audit is charged with examining and evaluating the policies, procedures, and systems which are in place to ensure: the reliability and integrity of data; compliance with Federal and State policies and laws; the safeguarding of assets; and, the economical and efficient use of resources. Internal audit conducts an overall risk assessment process on a yearly basis that is updated as new risks, programs or laws change. We provide oversight, monitoring, and training regarding internal controls, compliance with federal grant laws and sub recipient monitoring requirements, and compliance with State laws and regulations. The Internal Audit Director chairs the Accountability Council at USOE, which serves as a forum to discuss system wide monitoring, compliance, and other tools and methods to utilize State and Federal funds effectively and make the public education system efficient and compliant.

In cooperation with the USOE School Finance division, the Internal Audit division reviews each LEA's financial and single audit each year and follows up on significant findings. Internal Audit also reviews financial and single audits of significant non-profit, state, local government, and other non-LEA sub recipients and follows up on audit findings.

Internal Audit manages a statewide hotline which is available to all public education employees and the public covering all LEAs and statewide public education issues.

Under the direction of the Audit Committee, Internal Audit conducts audits, reviews, and investigations based on issues noted in risk assessments, hotline calls, and other various referral or determination methods. These audits are conducted on individual LEAs, programs, USOE divisions, federal programs, or any other matter that is under the direction of the Board. Internal Audit also provides an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity that adds value by overviewing and improving

operations system wide.

The Internal Audit department acts as a liaison between the USOE and LEAs in State and Federal audits. The Internal Auditors devote time to creating training and reference materials and doing presentations for all stakeholders in the Public Education system.

The USOE Internal Audit Department evaluates and reviews the effectiveness of risk management, internal controls, and governance processes and acts as a deterrent to fraud. Internal Audit at the USOE provides important oversight and monitoring of over \$3 billion of education funds. All Internal Auditors at the USOE hold advanced degrees. The Director is a licensed Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and a Certified Fraud Examiner. The other staff members are taking exams to earn the CPA designation and all members are working on obtaining the Certified Internal Auditor designation. The Internal Auditors are experienced, devote time to train USOE and LEA staff, and review and improve programs and processes at USOE and throughout the State.

State Citations:

*Utah Constitution*

Article X, Section 3 – Vests general control and supervision of the public education system in the Board.

*Utah Code*

53A-1-401(3) – Directs the Board to adopt rules to promote quality, efficiency and productivity, and to eliminate unnecessary duplication in the public education system.

53A-1-405 – Makes the Board responsible for verifying audits of local school districts.

53A-1-402(1)(e) – Directs the Board to develop rules and minimum standards regarding cost effectiveness measures, school budget formats, and financial accounting requirements for the local school districts.

53A-17a-147(2) – Directs the Board to assess the progress and effectiveness of local school districts and programs funded under the Minimum School Program and report its findings to the Legislature.

63I-5-101-401 – Sets forth the expectation that various State Agencies will conduct internal audit procedures. This section also requires the State Office of Education to conduct various types of auditing procedures as determined by the Board.

51-2a-201 – Receive and review audited LEA financial statements and advise further action based upon the findings in these reports.

*Utah Administrative Code*

R277-116 – Internal Audit procedures

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

**Federal Regulatory Functions:**

Internal Audit provides oversight and training to USOE Federal program divisions and individual LEAs to ensure state wide compliance with the requirements of all of the EDGAR and OMB Circulars listed below. Internal Audit conducts audits, reviews, and assessments of internal controls at the USOE, LEAs, and other non LEAs sub recipients to evaluate and assess compliance with Federal regulations.

Internal Audit determines compliance with single audit requirement, reviews annual audits, and issues

audit determination letters. Internal Audit works with sub recipients to improve internal controls and processes in the resolution of findings. Reports are issued to the Board and to the public on these matters.

*Federal Grants administered by USOE (approximately \$507 million in FY2013):*

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Grants (various grants)

Education Jobs

Special Education (IDEA, Preschool)

Title I Programs

Child Nutrition (School Lunch)

Career and Technical Education

Adult Education

Vocational Rehabilitation-USOR

Independent Living-USOR

Public Charter Schools

After School 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Technology Literacy

Improving Teacher Quality

State Assessment

Student Record Exchange

School Improvement Grants

Disability Determination-USOR

**Federal Regulations:**

**Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)**

**34 CFR Part 80 .20-.26, .40 – applies to state and local governments (districts)**

**34 CFR Part 74 .20-.28, .40 – applies to non-profit organizations (charter schools)**

The State must expend and account for grant funds in accordance with State laws and procedures. Fiscal controls and accounting procedures of the State, as well as its sub grantees and contractors must be sufficient to:

- 1) Prepare accurate reports required by grants
- 2) Permit the tracing of funds to a level of expenditure adequate to demonstrate allocable costs
- 3) Financial management systems must meet the following standards
  - a. Accurate, current, and complete financial reporting
  - b. Accounting records must be maintained by individual grants and financial categories
  - c. Effective control and accountability must be maintained for all grant and sub grant cash, property, and other assets
  - d. Actual expenditures must be compared to established budgets, and other performance data
  - e. Applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) costs principles, grant regulations followed to determine allowable costs
  - f. Accounting records must be supported by source documentation
  - g. Procedures for minimizing the time elapsing between the transfer of fund from the Federal Treasury to grantees and sub grantees. Controls are in place over cash advances.

The State must monitor and ensure compliance with the items above as well as the following federal requirements for each grant at the state level and at the sub grantee level (LEAs).

1. Timely payments to sub grantees and compliance with cash management principles

2. Allowable costs and activities
3. Period of availability of funds for expenditures and reimbursement
4. Matching or cost sharing requirements
5. Allowability and application of income earned on federal funds
6. Compliance with single audit act OMB Circular A-133

***Federal Office of Budget and Management (OMB) Circulars:***

*A-87 – Cost Principles State and Local Governments*

*A-122 – Cost Principles Non-Profit Organizations*

The State is responsible to monitor compliance at the USOE, all LEAs, and other non-profits who are awarded funds through the USOE. These cost circulars establish principles and standards for determining costs and allowability of costs charged to federal grant programs.

*A-133 – Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*

*Subpart D. 105(d) Pass-through entity responsibilities*

- (1) Identification of Federal awards made to sub recipients, including required communications
- (2) Notification to sub recipients of applicable Federal and State laws, rules, or regulations
- (3) Monitoring activities of sub recipients to ensure Federal awards are used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations, and performance goals
- (4) Ensure sub recipients that expend more than \$500,000 in Federal assistance obtain required single audit
- (5) Issue management decisions on audit findings within six months of audit report and ensure that sub recipient takes appropriate and timely corrective action

**State Regulatory Functions:**

**Audits/Reviews/Investigations:**

Under the direction of the audit committee of the Board, Internal Audit conducts audits, reviews, and investigations based on issues noted in risk assessments, hotline calls, and other various referral or determination methods. These audits are conducted on individual LEAs, programs, USOE divisions, federal programs, or any other matter that is under the direction of the Board. The Federal citations above and the State citations below are examples of the areas that are covered. Audits, reviews, and investigations range from overall state compliance with fee schedules, transportation rules, and appropriate use of School Trust LAND funds, to the appropriate use of restricted state or federal funds.

Internal Audit is the investigative arm of the USOE for allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse at the State or LEA level. Investigations are generated by hotline calls, requests derived from the Internal Audit risk assessment, the Board audit committee, USOE, USOR, USDB, LEAs, or referrals from the State Auditor's Office. In some cases, financial investigations have been conducted to assist in investigations of the Utah Professional Practices Advisory Committee in matters of teacher licensure.

Internal Audit receives requests from the State Charter Board and their staff to conduct audits or reviews of charter related issues, monitoring of charter compliance with financial requirements, and in some cases assists in the review of accounting documentation and records in matters of noncompliance with fiscal benchmarks, charter revocation, and instances of fraud, waste, or abuse.

Internal Audit provides an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity. Any program or activity under the charge of the Board is subject to review and analysis. Activities conducted by the USOE on a state wide level are subject to review by Internal Audit. The calculation of the MSP budget, distribution of MSP or other State and Federal funds, and the administration of Federal and State programs are also subjects of Internal Audit reviews.

**Hotline Calls:**

Allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse are reported to internal staff through using the Hotline Reporting Form or through calling the hotline number. Internal Audit staff investigates allegations and may issue reports to the Audit Committee on findings of reports. This important function safeguards taxpayer dollars and public efficiency, and monitors compliance with State and Federal guidelines.

**Liaison for all external auditors:**

State and Federal auditing agencies perform audits on the activities of the USOE and the LEAs yearly. Internal Audit serves as a liaison between the auditors and the programs or individuals being audited. Data and information is coordinated to avoid duplication of efforts, and audit findings and responses are coordinated through Internal Audit.

Internal Audit also services as an audit clearinghouse for the public education system. In conjunction with School Finance, LEA and non LEA audits are reviewed and finding determination letters, including corrective action plans are issued from Internal Audit.

**State Code Citations:**

*Utah Constitution*

Article X, Section 2 – Defines the public education system.

Article X, Section 3 – Vests general control and supervision of the public education system in the State Board of Education.

Article X, Section 5 – Defines the State School Fund and the Uniform School Fund.

**Utah Code/Board Rules:**

53A-1-401 – General control and supervision vested to the Board, adopt rules and guidelines over distribution of state funds, develop policies and procedures related to federal education programs.

R277-114 – Corrective action and withdrawal or reduction of program funds.

R277-116 – Internal Audit procedures. Requires establishment of internal audit program and audit committee responsibilities.

53A-17a-147(2) – Directs the Board to assess the progress and effectiveness of local school districts and programs funded under the Minimum School Program and report its findings to the Legislature.

R277-419 – Pupil Accounting

R277-484 – Data Standards

R277-477 – Distribution of funds from the interest and dividend account (School LAND Trust funds) and administration of the School LAND Trust Program.

53A-1a-704 – Carson Smith Scholarship Program.

*Minimum School Program*

53A-1a-513 and R277-470 – Funding for charter schools.

53A-1a-1001 – UPSTART home-based educational technology program to develop school readiness skills of preschool children.

53A-2-206 – Interstate students inclusion in attendance count, and funding for foreign exchange students.

53A-16-101 et seq. – Provides for State Financing of Public Education including 53A-16-101.5 which provides for fund allocations and reporting requirements for the School LAND Trust Program.

R277-477 – Distribution of funds from the Interest and Dividend Account and Administration of the School LAND Trust Program.

53A-17a-101 et seq. – State Board of Education to administer the Minimum School Program (MSP) and all State Board of Education Rules associated with distribution of the MSP.

- a. Rule R277-110 – Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment
- b. Rule R277-407 – School Fees
- c. Rule R277-419 – Pupil Accounting for MSP
- d. Rule R277-422 – State Supported Voted Leeway, Local Board-Approved Leeway and Local Board Leeway for Reading Improvement Programs
- e. Rule R277-423 – Delivery of Flow-Through Money
- f. Rule R277-424 – Indirect Costs for State Programs
- g. Rule R277-445 – Classifying Small Schools as Necessarily Existent
- h. Rule R277-459 – Calculate and distribute Classroom Supplies funds
- i. Rule R277-460 – Distribute Substance Abuse Prevention funds
- j. Rule R277-467 – Distribute Library Books and Electronic Resources funds
- k. Rule R277-470 – Charter School Financial Practices and Training
- l. Rule R277-478 – Block Grant Funding
- m. Rule R277-486 – Professional Staff Cost Program
- n. Rule R277-489 – Early Intervention Program
- o. Rule R277-600 – Student Transportation Standards and Procedures
- p. Rule R277-709 – Education Programs Serving Youth in Custody
- q. Rule R277-713 – Concurrent Enrollment of Students in College Courses
- r. Rule R277-725 – Electronic High School
- s. Rule R277-733 – Adult Education Programs
- t. Rule R277-735 – Corrections Education Programs
- u. Rule R277-750 – Education Programs for Students with Disabilities
- v. Rule R277-751 – Special Education Extended School Year
- w. Rule R277-911 – Secondary Career and Technical Education

53A-21 et seq. – Public Education Capital Outlay Act

59-2-902 – Minimum Basic Tax Levy for School Districts

59-2-905 – Minimum Rate of Levy for State's Contribution to Minimum School Program

59-2-924 – Valuation of Property to County Auditor and Commission

*Pupil Accounting and Financial Data*

53A-17a-106 and R277-419 – Establish standards for student membership data that is the basis for determining WPU's in the MSP

53A-17a-107 and R277-486 – Maintain data and calculate distribution for the Professional Staff Cost Program

53A-17a-109 and R277-445 – Administer the Necessarily Existent Small Schools Program

53A-17a-153 and R277-110 – Calculate the Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment

R277-459 – Calculate distribution of the Classroom Supplies and Materials appropriation

*Financial Audit*

51-2a-201 – Determine compliance with LEA audit requirements

53A-1-405 – Makes the Board responsible for verifying audits of local school districts

53A-16-103 – State Board to distribute funding, many based on financial data

*Charter Schools*

53A-1a – Establishes provisions to create, monitor, and terminate charter schools

R277-481 – Charter School oversight, monitoring and appeals

*Compliance with the following standards:*

Generally Accepted Accounting Principles

Generally Accepted Auditing Standards

Government Auditing Standards

State of Utah Legal Compliance Audit Guide - Utah State Auditor's Office

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The Internal Audit department provides oversight over \$3 billion in State and Federal funds. The majority of these funds are spent by local LEAs.

The USOE's Internal Audit department is available to the Board, the State Charter School Board, LEA boards, the USDB, the USOR boards, LEA superintendents and directors, USOE staff, all public education employees, and the public. In a survey of the 125 LEAs in operation in calendar year 2012, conducted by the Associate Superintendent of School Finance, 41 school districts responded that they devote a **combined total of 5.4 FTEs and 6.4 individual employees to some kind of an internal audit function.** Some districts allocate between .25-.50 of an existing accountant position to perform minimal internal audit functions. Only four school districts report a full FTE and single person performing internal audit duties. Thirty-seven of the 84 charter schools responded to the survey and none reported any internal audit functions being conducted. That is only 5% of our LEAs devoting any resources to an internal audit function. See estimate of the cost associated with having an internal auditor in each LEA in the "cost avoidance section."

All of the many functions of Internal Audit are designed to review the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of public education dollars as well as compliance with numerous Federal and State laws. However, a continual risk assessment process and constant training are the key element in deterring fraud, waste, and abuse. This most likely does not occur in LEAs that do not have a full time internal audit position.

Monthly meetings of the Board Audit Committee inform and spur on action in the form of notifications, training, and other communications to the public education system as a whole. The Internal Audit office has become a clearinghouse of various issues noted regarding noncompliance in use of taxpayer dollars, intentional and non-intentional manipulation of student data and funding guidelines, and reports of fraud.

Recent developments in state government regarding rampant noncompliance with state guidelines and lack of oversight in the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control highlights the ramifications of not having an internal audit department reviewing and monitoring compliance, assessing internal controls, doing routine reviews of transactions and all of the other internal audit functions that act as a deterrent

for fraud.

During calendar year 2013, the USOE's Internal Audit staff of three issued 12 memos/monitoring letters, nine audit reports and investigated nine hotline calls. In total, 35 different projects, hotline calls, and audits were investigated. That is a rate of about 2 reports or determination letters issued a month. Also, over 125+ LEA audits were reviewed, determination letters were sent, and followed up occurred. Internal Audit serves as the liaison between all State and Federal audits throughout the year, including the State's financial and single audits.

Internal Audit serves as an important training resource. Over the past year, the Internal Audit Director and staff have presented at two charter school director and financial trainings, as part of the Utah State Auditor's Office Auditor Update meeting, at the UIAA annual conference, to the State Board of Education, the USU coaching seminar, and in various federal program director meetings. During the calendar year of 2013, Internal Audit, with the help of the USOE's School Law and Legislation division, drafted a new Board rule over LEA Fiscal Policies and Accountability, worked on a training manual, and drafted model polices for fiscal practices. Training courses provided by Internal Audit are much more cost effective than hiring outside consultants. Furthermore, training material can be provided to all LEA staff at little to no costs, and incur no additional personnel costs.

LEAs and other entities under the governance of the Board can utilize the skills and services of Internal Audit at no charge. LEAs can request internal control reviews and consultations, policy and procedure evaluations, fraud audits, training, and any other type of review they require.

The following are some of the reviews, audits, and evaluations conducted by Internal Audit:

- Internal Audit reviews and evaluates internal controls over the USOE and LEAs throughout the State.
- Conduct program, financial, and performance audits, reviews, and monitoring as directed by the Audit Committee, the Board, and the Internal Audit risk assessment.
- Investigate and review matters reported on the Internal Audit hotline.
- Internal Audit personnel provide LEA training, professional development, and support free of charge.
- Internal Audit personnel provide expertise at costs lower than similar private industry positions.
- Coordination with other state agencies lends expertise and address changes over time.
- MSP funds are distributed after an intense review of data for accuracy and completeness.
- Staff provides trainings to LEA's boards and administration.
- LEAs receive training on internal controls at various conferences, on-site, on-line, and as requested.
- Internal control trainings maintain the confidence of the public, provide tools for LEAs to manage their resources and fiduciary responsibilities, protect LEA's resources from errors, waste, or abuse, ensure compliance with LEA policies and State and Federal law, and protect employees in the most cost effective way.
- Evaluate and recommend internal controls over various key processes.

*Example audit reports issued:*

2013-12 Monitoring of the Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind

2013-01 Fiscal year 2012 Financial and Single audits for LEAs

2012-22 Monitoring of the Roads to Independence  
 2012-24 Performance Audit of Utah’s Diagnostic Assessment System Contract for K-3 Reading  
 2012-09A Audit of SEPS Learning Center Compliance with Carson Smith Scholarship Requirements  
 2012-09B Review of Carson Smith Scholarship Monitoring Process at the USOE  
 2012-28 Monitoring of Education Jobs Funds Fiscal Year 2013  
 2012-17 Monitoring of Education Jobs Funds Fiscal Years 2012 & 2013  
 2012-08 Monitoring of Salt Lake Arts Academy

*Examples of tasks/projects completed:*

Verification of ARRA required reports (quarterly since 2009)  
 Update of the State Legal Compliance Guide through the State Auditor’s Office  
 Review draft board rules and potential legislation  
 Drafting of financial accounting and internal control manual for individual schools  
 Verification of payroll certification process at USOE  
 Verification of data, formulas, and MSP budget/distribution

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul>	\$ 318,407 \$ 0 \$ 0
Total Funding	\$ 318,407 Fiscal year 2013

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges</li> </ul>	\$ 264,146 \$ 1,916 \$ 19,855 \$ 32,490
Total Costs	\$ 318,407 Fiscal year 2013 (1 director, 2 staff)

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Provisions for the establishment of internal audit functions are set forth in *Utah Code*. If the Board did not have an internal audit function they would not be in compliance with *Utah Code*. Furthermore, the exposure to risk to the public education system would grow exponentially year after year. The LEAs would be burdened with task of providing more FTEs for internal audit functions, taking education dollars out of classrooms and away from teachers. Internal audits that are presently being conducted would costs LEAs significant amounts of money, whereas now the Board provides the internal audit service at no charge. It is more than likely that audits and reviews, aside from the required annual financial statement and single audit, would only be conducted as responses to significant legal matters,

thus increasing the costs of waste, inefficiency, and potential errors or misappropriations system wide.

LEAs could also hire outside audit firms to conduct internal audit functions, or could hire a firm to audit a group of LEAs. However, outside audit firms do not have a thorough nor working knowledge of the public education budget and allocation system, nor detail knowledge of the Federal and State Compliance requirements of the Department of Education Federal grants. Costs per hour (evaluated below) are much higher in public accounting firms, depending on the size of the firm. Availability of external auditors to conduct internal audit functions may be limited to specific times of the year. Continual risk assessment and training could not occur on a daily or on an as needed basis. The perception of monitoring and detection deteriorate the more removed “internal auditors” are from the function and processes they audit. The same applies to external audit costs that would be incurred by USOR, USDB, and the USOE.

Each Federal program area at the USOE would have to be reviewed for compliance in general matters, including reviewing LEA and other sub recipient financial statement audits and following up on findings. Currently, few of the federal programs employ staff that has the professional qualifications or experience to evaluate audit findings and compliance and render audit determinations. This would significantly reduce the efficiency of the USOE staff in federal programs, and cause duplication of efforts and potentially result in overall noncompliance at the State level.

Findings of noncompliance can also result in questioned costs and potential loss of federal funds. Significant findings of this magnitude could impact the State’s ability to obtain and retain federal funding, resulting in decreased services to children with disabilities, low income and disadvantaged students, decreased career and technology and college readiness programs, adult education, and other federal programs.

If there was no consistent oversight being performed by Internal Audit, there would be a greater chance of errors, waste, or misappropriations system wide. Public confidence in state governance and public education would significantly be diminished. Transparency and the accuracy of data and reports generated and used by the legislature to make decisions could be compromised. Furthermore, there would be little to no oversight of LEAs or expenditures made at the USOE. This could result in reduced funding from state appropriations. Reduced federal funds, decreased state appropriations and all instances of fraud, waste, or abuse reduce funds available to reduce class sizes, purchase educational materials, increase teacher salaries, and fund professional development.

Inadequate oversight increases the risk of noncompliance and fraud in every level of the public education system. Inadequate oversight at the state level leads to inadequate oversight at the LEA level. Insufficient system wide oversight has significant impacts on student’s education, safety, and health, resulting in untold costs.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

It is difficult to quantify the costs of fraud, noncompliance, and inefficiency that are saved as a result of internal audit functions, as the goal of internal audit is primarily to deter fraud through proper internal controls and risk assessments.

During the fiscal year 2013, the State Auditor’s Office questioned \$30,000 in the Career and Technology Education grant. Internal audit was also able to reduce over \$5,000 in questioned costs pertaining to

the Utah State Office of Rehabilitation. Internal audit was able to perform procedures and reviews to eliminate these questioned costs before the audit was issued. These are costs that would have had to be repaid to the Federal Department of Education with unrestricted state dollars.

During the fiscal year 2012, monitoring conducted by Internal Audit on EduJobs was used by the State Auditor's Office to remove over \$2 million in questioned costs.

The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, in the 2012 Report to the Nations on Occupational Fraud and Abuse report that typical organizations typically lose 5% of their revenue to fraud each year (<http://www.acfe.com/rtnn.aspx>). Over \$500 million dollars in federal funds were administered by USOE in fiscal year 2013. If even 1% of those expenditures were questioned or lost to fraud that would result in a loss to the public education system of \$5,000,000, 5% results in a loss of \$25,000,000.

The same calculation can be completed for state funding. Approximately \$3 billion in state funds are appropriated by the legislature each year. If even 1% of the total is lost to fraud, waste, or abuse that results in a system wide loss of \$30 million and that doesn't take into consideration local property tax revenues or revenue generated at the individual LEA level through student fees, donations, and fundraisers.

During calendar year 2013, internal audit created comprehensive fiscal model policies to aid LEAs in complying with the provisions of Board Rule 277-113. Internal audit developed model policies for cash receipts, expenditures, fundraisers, and donations, gifts, and sponsorships. These model policies address the establishment of internal controls and procedures over the above areas, compliance with Utah code, requirements for retained documentation and approvals, and directives concerning school sponsored activities. It took the two internal audit staff approximately a month to gather documents, evaluate documentation, draft model policies and procedures, and gather or create corresponding forms. Four weeks at eight hours a day is approximately 160 hours per auditor, or 320 hours total, which is a conservative estimate. At the average internal audit rate in FY2013 of \$42 (\$264,146/2080/3 salary and benefits), the estimated cost of the policy work for LEAs is approximately \$13,500. Internal audit services were provided to the LEAs at no charge. Had a consultant or attorney at a law firm draft the required policies using the same hour estimate at an average rate of \$75 an hour, it would have cost the district \$24,000. However; the average lawyer fee in the public sector is closer to \$150. Thus the policies would have cost each LEA about \$48,000.

Internal Audit provides a significant amount of assistance to LEAs on how to implement effective internal controls and monitoring procedures. During calendar year 2013, the USOE internal audit staff has conducted internal control and expenditure reviews on 10 entities (8 LEAs and two sub recipients). These reviews usually take two auditors between 40-80 hours to complete. This would result in a cost of about \$3,360 per review, and approximately \$6,000 if a public CPA firm were to conduct these reviews at a rate of \$75 per hour. Again, these reviews were provided at no charge.

During calendar year 2013, the internal audit team planned training for all LEAs and directors at the USOE regarding the changes to the procurement code. Internal Audit estimates that it took about 30 hours of time to plan and research topics, prepare training materials, and the presentation. This presentation was presented six times, reaching over 100 charter school directors and charter business managers, over 20 USOE directors or support staff, and over 15 district legal counsel representatives, and the UIAA (athletic director) conference. The presentation lasted 1-2 hours. If each school district and charter school had to prepare their own presentation materials or hire an outside presenter to

cover these topics, a conservative estimate of in house costs would be around \$500. If all LEAs were required to prepare this training, we estimate the costs for 131 LEAs to be \$65,550 to the public education system.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

Internal Audit staff provides expertise, training and experience with the public education system for an average cost of \$42 per hour. Currently only 5.4 FTEs in 125 LEAs are devoted to internal audit functions.

If each District assigned one FTE, and each charter assigned .5 FTE to internal audit functions we estimate the cost to be approximately \$7,512,960. (Districts:  $42 \times 2080 \times 41 = \$3,581,760$  and Charters:  $42 \times 1,040 \times 90 = \$3,931,200$ ).

If public accounting firms or consultants were hired to provide internal audit function for LEAs, we estimate the costs to be approximately \$13,416,000. (Districts:  $75 \times 2080 \times 41 = \$6,396,000$  and Charters:  $75 \times 1,040 \times 90 = \$7,020,000$ ). However, at \$75 an hour it is unlikely that LEAs would contract for services at a less than part time status, or for individual functions, and would not benefit from the oversight of a full time internal audit position.

Internal Audit provides oversight to LEAs for only \$264,146 in personnel costs. The USOE internal audit staff is more efficient due to extensive knowledge about the public education system, laws and regulations governing state and federal programs, and extensive experience and training regarding internal controls. Furthermore licensure and training costs benefit the entire public education system as a whole, instead of individual LEAs. Training materials, presentations and other resources can be developed using the most recent knowledge and expertise and distributed to all LEAs. Having consistent training available to all LEAs reduces overall system inefficiencies and redundancies.

The following is a comparison of other internal audit staff and total funds overseen by State agencies based on calendar year 2011 data:

Agency	# of staff	\$ budget of audit focus
Department of Alcohol & Beverage Control	2	\$36,000,000
State Courts	4	\$132,558,400
Department of Natural Resources	4	\$170,000,000
Department of Corrections	6	\$237,000,000
Department of Community & Culture	1	\$282,000,000
Department of Human Services	6	\$650,000,000
Office of Inspector General (DOH)	31+	\$1,800,000,000
Department of Health	3	\$2,200,000,000
Department of Workforce Services	5	\$2,400,000,000
State Board of Education	3*	\$3,000,000,000
Board of Regents (all IHEs)	28	\$4,000,000,000
Office of Legislative Auditors	27	\$11,500,000,000
State Auditor's Office	45	\$18,800,000,000
* not including 5.5 FTE at LEAs		
+includes all nurses, Dr.s and other staff that evaluate claims with audit department		

The Internal Audit division is an essential section for the public education system overall. In comparison

to other state agencies and the amount of funds overseen the USOE internal audit division is understaffed and would be able to better serve the public education system with additional FTEs. The risks associated with \$3 billion dollars being expended by the LEAs, with varying levels of financial experience, staffing resources, drastically differing internal control environments, and varying levels of oversight are great.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

Alternative costs are listed above as contractors or current sources of revenue would need to be redirected from classrooms to other areas of staffing to perform the tasks now being performed by the State Board of Education’s Internal Audit department. If each school district were to hire a full time person dedicated to perform internal audit functions it is estimated that it would cost around \$90,000 in salaries and benefits. Internal Auditors with experience in government and education, as well as internal auditing methods would most likely costs around \$120,000 in salaries and benefits. Many of our LEAs would struggle to hire someone with the qualifications and experience that would want to reside in some of the rural districts.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Benefits	\$ 7.5-\$13.4 million system wide
Costs	\$ 318,407
Benefit/Cost	23.6 – 42.1

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Informal Science Education Enhancement Program (iSEE)**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Public Education Funding Bill and State Board Rule R277-444: The purpose of the arts and science program is to provide opportunities for students to develop and use the knowledge, skills, and appreciation defined in the arts and science Core curricula through in-depth school instructional services, performances or presentations in school and theatres, or arts or science museum tours. Current members of the iSEE include: Red Butte Gardens, the Natural History Museum of Utah, Discovery Gateway, the Clark Planetarium, the Leonardo, and the Living Planet Aquarium. There are two additional institutions participating in the open RFP: Thanksgiving Point and Hawkwatch International.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Organizations funded through an RFP process shall submit annual applications to the USOE. Applications shall be provided by the USOE.
- The designated USOE specialist(s) shall make final funding recommendations following a review of applications by designated community representatives to the Board by August 31 of the school year in which the money is available.
- Application for eligible organizations to become a POPS organization is possible every year through the following process:
  - Organizations submit a letter of intent and a master plan for servicing the schools to the designated USOE specialist(s) by the first day of October to determine eligibility and accordingly respond with an invitation to meet and complete the application and evaluation process required of all established POPS and arts and science subsidy organizations in their re-application procedure every four years.
  - The completed application, original letter of intent, and recommendations based on the evaluation are submitted to the Board through the designated USOE specialist(s) by June 1.
  - The Board or designee meets with the designated USOE specialist(s) to determine whether or not to approve the applicant as a candidate to become a POPS organization.

- Funds shall be distributed annually beginning in August.
- Organizations may be visited by USOE staff prior to funding or at school presentations during the funding cycle to evaluate the effectiveness and preparation of the organization.
- Organizations that receive arts and science funding shall submit annual evaluation reports to the USOE by July 1.
- The year-end report shall include (as reviewed by USOE):
  - a budget expenditure report and income source report using a form provided by the USOE, including a report and accounting of fees charged, if any, to recipient schools, districts, or organizations; and
  - record of the dates and places of all services rendered, the number of instruction and performance hours per district, school, and classroom service, as applicable, with the number of students and teachers served, including:
    - documentation that all school districts and schools have been offered opportunities for participation with all organizations over a three year period consistent with the arts and science organizations' plans and to the extent possible; and
    - documentation of collaboration with the USOE and school communities in planning visit preparation/follow up and content that focuses on the state Core curriculum; and
    - arts or science and their contribution(s) to students' development of life skills; and
  - a brief description of services provided by the organizations through the fine arts and science POPS, RFP, or arts and science subsidy programs, and if requested, copies of any and all materials developed; and
  - a summary of organization's evaluation of:
    - cost-effectiveness;
    - procedural efficiency;
    - collaborative practices;
    - educational soundness;
    - professional excellence; and
    - the resultant goals, plans, or both, for continued evaluation and improvement.
- The USOE may require additional evaluation or audit procedures from organizations to demonstrate use of funds consistent with the law and this rule.
- Maintain contact with iSEE organizations and oversee fidelity of projects to the RFP and state statute guidelines.
- Host monthly meetings with iSEE education director's to review community goals, provide professional development, and support iSEE program collaboration to improve outcomes.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- The year-end report shall include (as reviewed by USOE):
  - a budget expenditure report and income source report using a form provided by the USOE, including a report and accounting of fees charged, if any, to recipient schools, districts, or organizations; and
  - record of the dates and places of all services rendered, the number of instruction and performance hours per district, school, and classroom service, as applicable, with the number of students and teachers served, including:
    - documentation that all school districts and schools have been offered opportunities for participation with all organizations over a three year period consistent with the arts and science organizations' plans and to the extent possible; and
    - documentation of collaboration with the USOE and school communities in planning visit preparation/follow up and content that focuses on the state Core curriculum; and
    - arts or science and their contribution(s) to students' development of life skills; and
  - a brief description of services provided by the organizations through the fine arts and science POPS, RFP, or arts and science subsidy programs, and if requested, copies of any and all materials developed; and
  - a summary of organization's evaluation of:
    - cost-effectiveness;
    - procedural efficiency;
    - collaborative practices;
    - educational soundness;
    - professional excellence; and
    - the resultant goals, plans, or both, for continued evaluation and improvement.
- USOE creates an annual summary for legislative review of the iSEE program

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

Provide support to the Utah core science curriculum by leveraging the resources of Utah informal science providers. The partner groups of the iSEE organization are able to provide outreach and programming that LEA's across the state would not normally be able to access due to regional locations and costs associate with transportation and access to resources.

Performance Measures used to gauge progress to Outcome: Annual data regarding students reached, teachers involved in professional development, and number of hours spent engaging in the instruction of the Utah core science curriculum.

Five year history of performance measure data, including target accomplishments:

**2012-2013**

Teacher Experiences: 19,523

Student Experiences: 481,494

**2011-2012**

Teacher Experiences: 22,074

Student Experiences: 337,258

**2010-2011**

Teacher Experiences: 16,276

Student Experiences: 314,191

**2009-2010**

Teacher Experiences: 17,577

Student Experiences: 272,567

**2008-2009**

Teacher Experiences: 18, 577

Student Experiences: 370,037

Provide support to the Utah core science curriculum by leveraging the resources of Utah informal science providers. The partner groups of the iSEE organization are able to provide outreach and programming that LEA's across the state would not normally be able to access due to regional locations and costs associate with transportation and access to resources.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds* (Pass through)	\$2,100,000.00*	
• Federal Funds	\$0	
• State Appropriation Funds	\$ 13,095.59	
Total Funding	\$ 2,113,095.59	

**Section Costs: (10% of the Science Specialist Position in Teaching and Learning)**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 10,771.41	
• Travel Expenses	\$ 418.64	
• Current Expenses	\$ 526.80	
• Other Charges	\$ 1,378.74	
Total Costs	\$13,095.59	

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- The iSEE organizations would not have a coordinator to utilize for communication of leverage opportunities with other iSEE organizations.
- Best practices associated iSEE organizations would not be readily shared in monthly meetings, and hence the effectiveness of the programming provided to LEA's would decrease.
- Professional development for iSEE education staff would not be coordinated by the Utah State Office of Education, and would need to be paid for by the organizations on an individual basis.
- iSEE organizations would not have immediate access to science and math coordinators and educator networks provided by the Utah State Office of Education, reducing the statewide outreach efforts by these organizations.
- Fidelity to the state statute's funding guidelines would decrease, impacting K-12 education opportunities, specifically for rural areas.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- Typical grant administration fees in the education industry average 25% for the functions performed by the iSEE Program Coordinator.

\$2,174,074.00 (Total Amount for MSP Grant from the US Department of Education)

X 25%

\$536,768.50 for typical administrative fees

- Based on the projected administrative fees associated with the Math Science Partnership Administration, the Utah State Office of Education administration of this program saves \$523,672.91 in costs.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- The program avoids the cost of higher education institutions and K-12 LEA's employing grant writers to be able to compete for other similar funding available through competitive grants (Department of Education i3 grants, National Science Foundation Math and Science Partnership Grants, etc.)

\$ 50,000 (average salary for a full-time grant writer)

X 6 (iSEE institutions)

\$300,000 for full-time grant writers

- Based on the projected in cost associated with grant writers for the institutions, the Utah State Office of Education administration of this project saves \$300,000 to the six iSEE organizations to provide state level access to these funds and collaboration associated with grant-writing for the RFP.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

- Typical grant administration fees in the education industry average 25% for the functions performed by the iSEE Program Coordinator.

\$2,174,074.00 (Total Amount for MSP Grant from the US Department of Education)

X          25%

\$536,768.50 for typical administrative fees

- This cost would need to be covered by an outside agency or University housing the program for administration fees. Aside from the additional cost, it would decrease the amount of funds available to the iSEE organizations in Utah for providing education outreach to the state LEAs, thus lowering the number of teacher and students impacted by these state funds.

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

- Housing this program with the Utah State Office of Education saves a projected total of \$536,768.50 in administrative fees as well as \$300,000 in fees that would be incurred by the iSEE organizations to hire grant writers to gain access to these funds from a national competitive grant system.
- The benefits include impacting over 18,577 K-12 math and science teachers for professional development and 370,037 students with improved classroom instruction in math and science.
- The program also provides access to underrepresented education populations across the state of Utah, which can be guided by pairing the data gained by the Utah State Office of Education assessment office to meet immediate and data-driven needs within the education community.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: K-12 Literacy**

**Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:**

The K-12 Literacy Coordinator provides support for all schools and districts in the state of Utah in areas of literacy, English/Language Arts Core Standards, curriculum development, materials selection, early childhood programming, library media, open education resource development, online and face-to-face professional development, and logistical support for the statewide Core Academy. This includes:

- Supporting Utah educators and districts in the development of curriculum to be used in grades K-5;
- Providing support in creating, naming, and adding appropriate courses to the state course list;
- Responding to district questions about graduation requirements related to course codes and aligned curriculum;
- Support the development of the secondary English curriculum in the Electronic High School;
- Approving and monitoring of all professional learning offered by every district, charter school, and university for educator in-service procedures and credit for re-licensure and ongoing development in content expertise and effective instruction;
- Implementing professional learning for district teacher leaders and teachers through the development and coordination of focused opportunities for appropriate content and pedagogy instruction and discussion;
- Facilitating the design and implementation of the annual Core Academy focused on teacher development relative to the Utah Core Standards and associated instructional shifts;
- Monitoring endorsements in Reading and Library Media through evaluation of transcripts and recommendations for knowledge gaps for highly qualified teachers not yet highly qualified in subject area content or content specific exams as delineated by federal law (including review of PRAXIS Exams administered by the Educational Testing Service);
- Supporting teachers on State Approved Endorsement Plans who are working to become highly qualified within two years, including monitoring progress and coursework to ensure every child has a highly qualified teacher;
- Selecting and evaluation of Utah teachers to serve as members of the evaluation committee for instructional materials for students in ELA K-5;
- The evaluation of instructional materials, textbooks and Open Source materials and recommendations to districts as appropriate for use in elementary classrooms and supporting the Instructional Materials Commission Operating Procedure;
- Collaborating with assessment department to collect and report on DIBLES data and support the use of this assessment in grades K-3;
- Collaborating with assessment department to design and review content for the SAGE assessment;

- Reviewing Utah Writes in support of the Direct Writing Assessment in grade 5;
- Oversight, managing, and reporting of:
  - Early Intervention reading program (HB 513)
  - Early Intervention software program (HB 513)
  - Reading Achievement K-3 program (SB 2)
  - UPSTART research program
  - Development and implementation of handwriting instruction;
- Implementing of the Core Academy to support statewide teacher professional learning of Standards and content in all curricular areas;
- Design of professional learning experience in elementary Language Art sessions of Core Academy;
- Design of professional learning experience during school year to support elementary Language Art sessions of Core Academy;
- Development and approval of updated Core standards in content areas as per scheduled review;
- Development and implementation of elementary Principals' Literacy Institute.

**Administrative Rule**

- Rule R277-700. The Elementary and Secondary School Core Curriculum: Rule R277-700-4. Elementary Education Requirements.
- Rule R277-519 Educator Inservice Procedures and Credit
- Rule 277-502-5. Professional Educator License Areas of Concentration and Endorsements
- Rule R277-469 Instructional Materials Commission Operating Procedures
- Rule R277-404 Requirements for Assessments of Student Achievement

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Legislative reporting as required by programs listed above;
- Collect and report participating student data;
- Prepare and implement policy and procedures to ensure compliance with Administrative Code and Board Rule;
- Monitor school compliance with program requirements;
- Ensure that all educators working with students are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment;
- Provide Technical assistance to teachers, principals, professional development providers and LEAs;
- Provide general supervision of program compliance, fiscal compliance, and issue resolution through the Utah Consolidated Application;
- Manage communication and completion of assignments;
- Accept and process applications for program participants;
- Provide professional development for LEA leaders;
- Complete an annual performance plan with student impact and cost analysis for on-going evaluation procedures.

**State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:**

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to complete annual reports to the legislature and to provide additional reports and information upon request for the UPSTART and the HB 513 programs. The oversight of these programs includes a third party evaluation that reviews fidelity of implementation and the impact on student learning and achievement.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

The K-12 Literacy Coordinator position benefits elementary students, their teachers and the public at large in the following ways:

- Ensuring programs offered throughout Utah are research-based and promote effective instruction;
- Ensuring highly qualified statues are implemented for Reading and Library Media;
- Ensuring quality of demonstrated competency for Reading and Library Media endorsements;
- Ensuring high quality training for district teacher leaders;
- Ensuring high quality training for district teachers;
- Ensuring appropriate instructional materials, textbooks and Open Source materials are recommended to 41 districts and 85 charter schools for use in secondary classrooms and supporting the Instructional Materials Commission Operating Procedures;
- Ensuring all professional development offered by every district and charter school for educator in-service procedures and credit for re-licensure and ongoing development in content expertise and effective instruction.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

State Funds	\$ 181,454
Federal Funds	\$
State Appropriation funds	<u>\$ 1,472,365</u>
Total Funding	\$ 1,653,819

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 156,487
• Travel Expenses	\$ 4,000
• Current Expenses	\$ 2,302 (Phone and rent for cubicle)
• Program	\$ 1,491,030
• Total Costs	\$ 1,653,819

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

Failure of this position to provide the above services would result in the USOE being noncompliant with Utah Legislative direction, the inability of LEAs to implement the program and a loss of \$1,397,605 in services to Utah children. The oversight and implementation as outlined in statute and Board rule require the efforts of a qualified staff member working in concert with teachers, principals, and LEA staff. Specifics of this loss would include:

- Statutes to support state legislation would not be implemented and districts would create individual interpretations of the programs currently under USOE oversight;
- Information about state legislation and programs would not be disseminated statewide;
- Federal mandates for highly qualified teachers would not be implemented;
- Support for rural schools in implementing state approved curriculum would be limited or non-existent;
- Educational opportunities in Language Arts and Core Standards support for teachers would not be developed or implemented;
- Open Text / Open Source instructional materials and professional learning will not be developed in a vetted and appropriate manner;
- Statewide implementation of Core Standard language and understanding will not be conducted and districts would create individual interpretations of the Standards;
- Core Standards would be not be updated to reflect current instructional practice or understanding.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

If this position were eliminated, the system savings would be \$162,789 in direct costs. This does not include the savings as indicated below:

- The fiscal cost for individual to perform the functions of this position could be calculated by considering the cost of turning the oversight of each element of this position by each LEA in the state (42 districts, including the Utah School for the Deaf and Blind, and 85 Charter Schools). An approximation of the cost when calculated using an average hourly rate of \$40/hour x # hours x the number of LEAs (127 or as indicated) to determine the cost of turning the oversight over to them instead of using an efficiency of scale model.
  - Endorsements: review and determine compliance. Includes reviewing requirements, coordinating with universities and providers to ensure all curriculum and syllabi are appropriate, aligned with current research, and equitable through all systems. All LEAs have Reading and Library Media endorsements at some time, and would therefore need to continually update and review the endorsement.
    - 3 hours x 127 LEAS x \$40/hour = **\$15,240**
  - Providing professional development for teachers throughout the state of Utah to support the implementation of changes to the Core Standards, ensuring statewide consistency for all LEAs that will improve state performance on assessments.
    - Core Academy: overall estimated cost per participant (\$254.65) broken into

program cost (\$173.03) and logistics cost (catering and lodging). This position oversees logistics. Current cost of professional development is \$635 for a 4 day. The logistics portion is \$135/participant.  $\$254.65/\text{participant} \times 4,219 \text{ participants} =$   
**\$743,892**

- School-year professional development: development of professional development that supports the implementation of the Core Standards for all districts as a best practice development to build district capacity.  $100 \text{ hours} \times 127 \text{ LEAs} \times \$60/\text{hour} =$   
**\$777,240**

- Legislative reporting and review: all LEAs that receive funding must report to the Legislature the use of funds and effectiveness of the program. Information must be collected, reviewed, and presented in a meaningful way. This estimate is based on 2/3 of actual time to account for LEAs that do not have to complete every report.  $60 \text{ hours} \times 127 \text{ LEAs} \times \$40/\text{hour} =$   
**\$304,800**

**TOTAL SYSTEM SAVINGS OF COSTS TO DISTRICT AS A RESULT OF THIS POSITION: \$1,841,172**

*This does not include the time and resource development connected to this particular position that will ultimately build the capacity of teacher leaders in each district in Utah.*

#### ***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

One of the most critical aspects of this position and the USOE is the coordination of implementation of programs. If districts and charter schools are not coordinated in their efforts in implementing Standards or legislative programs, the standardization that leads to productive learning and which contributes to positive growth on assessments is limited.

The cost of uncoordinated student programming is unfathomable in terms of human cost. It could also reduce both the state's and LEAs' ability to apply for and receive grant funding from federal or private programs.

There have been lawsuits filed in California and other states when parents determined that their child's teacher was not highly qualified or when parents have determined that the curriculum was out-of-date and not relevant to students' preparations for post-secondary school or work. If even one teacher in the state was found to be teaching a class without the proper endorsement, it open Utah up to the liability of a lawsuit. A typical estimate might be \$200,000 per suit.

#### ***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

##### **COSTS:**

- The cost of this position is \$162,789
- The budget for program implementation in this position is \$1,653,819.
- **Total costs: \$1,818,261**

**BENEFITS:**

- Estimated saving to districts as a result of this position: **\$1,841,172**

**AVOIDANCE:**

- Estimated \$200,000 in lawsuits avoided by ensuring teachers are properly credentialed and endorsed to teach as promised to parents and citizens of Utah.
- Estimated \$200,000 in lawsuits avoided by ensuring curriculum and standards are updated and appropriate to support learning for all students in Utah.

**Estimated savings: \$1,841,172**

**Estimated avoidance: \$400,000**

**Estimated savings as a results of this position: \$2,241,172**

**Total savings as a result of this position to LEAs in Utah: \$422,911**

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: K-12 Science**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Teaching and Learning K-12 Science Program reports to the State Director of Teaching and Learning. The program and associated K-12 Science specialist provided technical support and leadership in the development and improvement of science education in the elementary and secondary schools of the state. The Science Specialist plans, develops, promotes, implements and evaluates programs in science. Provides statewide training for school personnel of all levels, parents, other state agencies and the public in science. Also, coordinates with colleges, universities and other educational institutions to improve the pre-service and in-service education of teachers, administrators and other school personnel. The specialist administers State and Federal grants, implementing and monitoring State and Federal legislation, and provides technical support in the area of current research-based practices.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code 53a-1-302. Implementation is governed by the following Board Rules: Board Rules on Core R277-700, R277-519; Board Rules on Licensing R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520; Utah Code on Licensing 53A-6; Board Rules on Instructional materials R277-269.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Provide statewide leadership in K-12 science core development.
- Coordinate and fund statewide professional development in science.
- Facilitate and provide professional development in elementary and secondary science.
- Work with Educator Licensing in the endorsing of in-service teachers, out-of-state educators, and alternative route to licensure (ARL) candidates.
- Recommend necessary changes to endorsement requirements based on research and data collection.
- Coordinate and/or act as a liaison between agency and stakeholders in science education community including institutes of higher education, K-12 LEAs, in-service and pre-service teachers, informal science providers, community interest groups and parents. Additionally, act as chair for the State Science Education Leadership Team.
- Serve on various boards, councils, committees, or task forces, both within the agency and outside

the agency, to coordinate agency activities and facilitate agency goals and initiatives.

- Coordinate with other curricular areas within the agency to support and facilitate agency goals and initiatives.
- Manages one or more statewide or agency wide programs; determine program goals and objectives and/or chair committees established to support the program. These projects include online science endorsement courses with UEN and SUU, development of open education resources for grades 3-12, and core academy professional development programming.
- Manage one or more federal programs; ensure compliance with applicable federal laws and regulations including budget and reporting requirements.
- Interpret, clarify, explain and apply agency policy and procedures, business practices, board rules and federal or state regulations; ensure compliance with applicable federal and/or state laws, regulations, and/or agency rules, standards and guidelines.
- Monitor budgets and maintain science web site.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section provides reports, data, and information upon request to administration, legislature, and public entities.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

**Policy Support**

- Update Science Core Standards with appropriate changes in content knowledge and technology to reflect progress and advances within the science community.
- Provide clarity in standards implementation and support for science education, including data and research on issues of societal concern such as evolution and global warming.
- Provide information, data, and research to Utah State Board of Education.
- Provide data to support informal science education programming statewide and data to university personnel for procurement of grants

**Ensuring high quality of teaching staff through endorsements**

- Highly qualified science teachers in all Utah classrooms.
- Develop and support for programs that provide endorsement courses for teachers.
- Professional development presentations for Utah teacher training science methods courses to provide knowledge about the Utah Core Curriculum and best practices.
- Development of teacher leaders through Core Academy facilitator training to support community and district needs in science.
- Coordinate teacher recognition programs such as the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching with the National Science Foundation and White House.

### **Leadership and assistance in evaluation of instructional materials**

- Improved student achievement through provision of quality instructional materials in all Utah science classrooms.
- Develop materials to support teachers in implementation of the science standards.
- Development of Open Education Resources for grades 3-12 science and maintaining website to vet and share best practices and policies in science education with the larger statewide science education community.

### **Technical Support for graduation requirements in science**

- Students graduating from Utah schools
- Charter schools developing programs and course sequencing to meet graduation standards in science
- Review and update the CACTUS course code offerings and descriptions for alignment.
- Lead high school recognition programming in science such as support for science competitions, program coordination for the National Youth Science Camp program for governor's office, and promoting information for science workshops, camps, and other opportunities within the state.

### **Professional Development**

- Deepen teachers' understanding of student expectations in the Utah Core.
- Deepen teachers' understanding of science in the Utah Core.
- Improve instructional models of standards implementation.
- Deepen teachers' understanding of the Utah Science Core with a focus on the expectations for conceptual understanding and skills through the Intended Learning Outcomes.
- Connect instruction and assessment of core standards as part of unit planning.
- Build capacity of teachers to plan and teach the Utah core with the materials they have available, rather than provide materials.
- Rethink the nature of science to include critical thinking and college readiness that supports procedural knowledge.
- Rethink what it means for students to be scientifically literate (College and Career Readiness Standards and Utah Core Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects):
  - Engaging students in instructional texts to support content knowledge development
  - Writing argumentative samples using data to support conclusions
  - Make sense of complex problems and persevere in solving them
  - Make strategic decisions about the use of technological tools
  - Critically engaging resources with attention to bias and research-based approaches
- Establish a culture of collaborative professional growth in a school with a focus on student

learning rather than just teaching.

- Develop a sense of shared responsibility for student learning.
- Engaging Industry and the Science Community within class and school application based learning
- Partnering with Higher Education and Informal Science institutions to leverage resources and improve learning opportunities for students.

**Professional development and technical assistance to districts for Common Core implementation**

- Develop tools and strategies to implement the Utah Core and help local agencies support required changes through provision of quality information.

**Production of Supports for Earth Science Core Implementation**

- Curriculum guides and other instructional supports to help teachers implement the updated Earth Science Core with fidelity.
- Support for Open Education Resources including textbook(s)

**Committee Participation**

- Provide expertise in science education to various committees and boards including Utah Science and Mathematics Education Committee, Utah Science Teachers Association, Council of State Science Supervisors, the Leonardo’s Education Advisory Board, the Rocky Mountain Space Grant’s Education Advisory Board, Discovery Gateway STEM Garden working group, the National Science Foundation Utah EPSCoR grant outreach and workforce development committee, STEM Action Center Professional Development Working Group, and others as requested to strengthen the comprehensive Utah educational system.
- Collaboration and coordination with higher education on policy and professional development that leads to a seamless transition between public education and higher education in science.
- Provide leadership on committees to strengthen the Utah educational system and support student learning in science, such as the Governor’s STEM initiative.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

	• Federal Funds		
	• State Appropriation Funds		
	• Professional Development Programming Costs	\$14,905.00	
	• Teaching and Learning Administration Personnel Costs	\$ 104,764.70	

Total Funding	\$ 119,669.70
---------------	---------------

**Section Costs: (80% of the Science Specialist Position in Teaching and Learning)**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 86,171.27
• Travel Expenses	\$ 3,349.10
• Current Expenses	\$ 4,214.40
• Other Charges	\$ 11,029.93
<b>TOTAL Costs</b>	<b>\$104,764.70</b>

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- The lack of policy support would result in dissimilar standards interpretation and programs in various LEA's resulting in an incoherent state-wide system of science education.
- Lack of qualified personnel to conduct state purchasing process in a technical subject.
- The lack of guidance for student preparation could result in under-preparedness for college and career.
- The lack of guidance for teacher endorsements could result in an under-qualified and ineffective teacher workforce in science and engineering.
- The lack of professional development support would result in large costs to districts (see below) who, if they lack funds to support these efforts, may suffer from a decreasingly effective workforce due to increasing scientific demands on students and teachers.
- If USOE were not here to provide access to innovative programs (such as OER and Core Academy) the districts and charters would not have the chance to benefit from the incredible cost savings available to them.
- The lack of on-site support for the Board of Education could result in the necessity of hiring outside research and evaluation firms.
- With no K-12 leadership in science education, industry support and higher education alignment would suffer.
- The absence of technical support at the state level may leave parents, teachers, and education leaders frustrated with no sounding board or source of information regarding science education.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Avoidance of lawsuits regarding educational malpractice or under qualified teacher issues @\$50,000 (estimate 5 per year)	\$250,000
---	-----------

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

Cost to Board of Education and/or LEAs to hire a research firm to collate science education research and/or perform data analysis @ \$20,000 per project X 4 projects/yr.	\$80,000
---	----------

Cost to LEAs to properly certify and endorse 164 teachers @ \$40 each	\$6560
---	--------

Cost to LEAs for personnel to answer questions and provide guidance to teachers regarding preparation and requirements for licensure/endorsement @ \$40/hr. X 4 hr./wk. X 52 weeks	\$8,320
--	---------

Cost to contract consultants to create materials @ \$85/hr. X 200 hr./yr. plus fees for secretarial and production services	\$37,000
---	----------

Cost to parents and school counselors to hire an Independent Educational Consultant to provide guidance for college and career readiness @ \$85/hr. X 5 hours/yr. X 125 LEAs	\$53,125
--	----------

Cost to LEAs to provide content-based professional learning @ 284 participants @ 500 each (not including logistics) for four day training	\$142,000
---	-----------

Cost to LEAs to provide leadership training	\$14,000
---	----------

Cost to LEAs to provide content based professional learning in district settings @ 7 grants of \$7000 + 25% administration costs	\$61,250
--	----------

Costs to LEAs and Universities to provide needs-based professional learning and presentations @ \$1500 per session X 30 presentations	\$45,000
---	----------

<b>Costs to LEAs for event planning, travel services, and accounting</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>
--	-----------------

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Total State Expenditures (State funds and section costs): \$104,764.70

Estimated cost savings: \$250,000

Estimated alternative service costs: \$482,255

**Net Benefit of position to state: \$627,490.30**

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Secondary Mathematics and STEM**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The STEM Coordinator in the department of Teaching and Learning manages programs in technology, science, and mathematics. The coordinator also serves as the secondary mathematics specialist. The following is a list of section functions, programs and statutory provisions fulfilled by the STEM coordinator:

**Secondary Mathematics Standards Support**

- Work with school Board to develop policy and practices regarding new mathematics standards
- Ensure students are served by highly qualified teachers through overseeing endorsement process for teachers of mathematics
- Provide leadership and assistance in evaluation of instructional materials
- Provide technical support for graduation requirements in mathematics
- Lead professional development efforts for mathematics teachers, including Core Academy
- Produce support materials for teachers, leaders, and parents to support mathematics Core implementation
- Collaborate with members of higher education faculty and members of industry to ensure students are prepared well in mathematics
- Promote rigor and relevance in mathematics instruction to ensure students are prepared for post-secondary mathematics instruction

**STEM Education Support**

- Coordinate USOE STEM programs with STEM Action Center Board and staff
- Provide leadership for USOE STEM Team
- Design and implement professional development related to STEM initiatives
- Serve on STEM committees statewide, including, but not limited to Engineering, Robotics, College Readiness, Technology
- Engage with policymakers to promote policy beneficial to STEM initiatives

Utah State Code and Board Rules associated with this program include: Section 53A-6, R277-700, R277-519, R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, and R277-520.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Ensure LEAs implement mathematics graduation requirements and course taking patterns outlined in Board Rules R277-700, R277-519.
- Support licensing functions to ensure teachers are properly licensed and endorsements according to Board Rules R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520 and Section 53A-6 in Utah Code.
- Develop and align instructional materials to Utah Core Standards as outlined in R277-269
- Implement requirements outlined in legislation including 2012 SB217 (S1) Math Materials Access Improvement Grant
- Participate in Implementation of middle school math materials outlined in 2013 SB139 S5

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Contribute to reports requested by legislature and Board regarding mathematics and STEM related policy, (i.e., 2012 SB217, and SB139S5)

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

**Policy Support**

- Ensure a smooth transition to the new Utah mathematics core.
- Provide clarity in standards implementation and support for mathematics education.
- Provide information, data, and research to USBE.
- Provide information, data, and research to STEM Action Center.

**Legislation Implementation**

- Conduct request for proposal process to award grant for math materials development and publication.
- Monitor progress and implementation of math materials development.
- Coordinate with staff at STEM Action Center to establish a STEM Action Center and carry out programs.

**Ensuring high quality of teaching staff through endorsements**

- Establish programs and assistance to ensure highly qualified mathematics teachers in all Utah classrooms.
- Provide support for programs that provide endorsement courses for teachers.

**Leadership and assistance in evaluation of instructional materials**

- Improve student achievement through provision of quality instructional materials in all Utah

mathematics classrooms.

- Provide technical assistance to STEM Action Center in selection of technologies to support core standards.
- Develop materials to support teachers in implementation of the mathematics standards.

### **Technical Support for graduation requirements in mathematics**

- Provide information and data to the USBE to inform policy regarding graduation requirements.
- Provide technical assistance to counselors and teachers in support of students.
- Provide information to USHE and serve on committees focused on college and career readiness.

### **Professional Development**

- Deepen teachers' understanding of student expectations in the Utah Core.
- Deepen teachers' understanding of mathematics in the Utah Core.
- Improve instructional models of standards implementation.
- Deepen teachers' understanding of the Utah Mathematics Core with a focus on the expectations for conceptual understanding and skills.
- Connect instruction and assessment of core standards as part of unit planning.
- Build capacity of teachers to plan and teach the Utah core with the materials they have available, rather than provide materials.
- Build capacity of teachers to instruct students on the nature of mathematics including reasoning and sense making that supports procedural knowledge
- Support teachers in building mathematical proficiency for their students (College and Career Readiness Standards and Adding It Up):
  - Attend to precision
  - Construct viable arguments
  - Make sense of complex problems and persevere in solving them
  - Look for structure
  - Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning
  - Make strategic decisions about the use of technological tools
- Establish a culture of collaborative professional growth in a school with a focus on student learning rather than just teaching.
- Develop a sense of shared responsibility for student learning.

### **Professional development and technical assistance to districts for Utah Mathematics Core standards implementation**

- Develop tools and strategies to implement the Utah Core and help local agencies support required changes through provision of quality information.

### **Production of Supports for Utah Mathematics Core Implementation**

- Produce curriculum guides and other instructional supports to help teachers implement the Utah Mathematics Core with fidelity.
- Produce publications for parents, school boards, and the public clarify the nature and substance of the new core.

- Provide support for Open Education Resources, including textbook(s).

**STEM Leadership**

- Work with legislators and the Governor’s Office to provide information, research, and expertise in developing STEM programs.
- Coordinate efforts of and provide leadership to USOE STEM Team.

**Committee Participation**

- Provide expertise in mathematics education to various committees and boards including Governor’s Science Advisory, Utah Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Association of State Supervisors of Mathematics, University of Utah NSF Engineering Grant Advisory Board, STEM AC Committee on College and Career Readiness, STEM AC Committee on Technology, STEM AC Committee on Professional Development, Engineering Education Partnership, USHE Senior Year of Math and others as requested to strengthen the comprehensive Utah educational system.
- Collaborate and coordinate with higher education on policy and professional development that leads to a seamless transition between public education and higher education in mathematics.
- Provide leadership on committees to strengthen the Utah educational system and support student learning in mathematics.

*Note: Collaboration and cooperation are key to maximizing precious resources and directing efforts for common purposes.*

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Professional Development Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$
• State Appropriation Funds	\$ 175,838
<b>Total Funding</b>	<hr/>

Note: These numbers do not reflect the addition of a STEM Specialist hired as liaison to the STEM Action Center.

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 137,151
• Travel Expenses	\$ 11,448
• Current Expenses	<u>\$ 27,239</u> Misc. office (indirect, rent, phone)
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$175,838</b>

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- The lack of policy support would result in dissimilar standards interpretation and programs in

various LEA's resulting in an incoherent state-wide system of mathematics education.

- Lack of qualified personnel to conduct state purchasing process in a technical subject.
- The lack of guidance for student preparation could result in under-preparedness for college and career.
- The lack of guidance for teacher endorsements could result in an under-qualified and ineffective teacher workforce in mathematics.
- The lack of professional development support (currently \$350,000) would result in large costs to districts (see below) who, if they lack funds to support these efforts, may suffer from a decreasingly effective workforce due to increasing mathematical demands on students and teachers.
- If USOE were not here to provide access to innovative programs such as Open Education Resources (OER) the districts and charters would not have the chance to benefit from the incredible cost savings available to them.
- The lack of on-site support for the Board of Education could result in the necessity of hiring outside research and evaluation firms.
- With no K-12 leadership in mathematics and STEM, industry support and higher education alignment would suffer.
- Efforts of the STEM AC may duplicate existing efforts in schools or be in conflict with them.
- The absence of technical support at the state level may leave parents, teachers, and education leaders frustrated with no sounding board or source of information regarding mathematics education.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Cost to Board of Education and/or LEAs to hire a research firm to collate mathematics education research and/or perform data analysis @ \$20,000 per project X 4 projects/yr.	\$80,000
Cost to LEAs to properly certify and endorse 86 teachers @ \$40 each	\$3440
Cost to LEAs for personnel to answer questions and provide guidance to teachers regarding preparation and requirements for licensure/endorsement @ \$40/hr. X 2 hr./wk. X 52 weeks	\$4,160
Cost to contract consultants to create materials @ \$85/hr. X 200 hr./yr. plus fees for secretarial and production services	\$37,000
Cost to parents and school counselors to hire an Independent Educational Consultant to provide guidance for college and career readiness @ \$85/hr. X 5 hours/yr. X 122 LEAs	\$51,850
Cost to LEAs to provide content-based professional learning @ 931 participants @ 500 each (not including logistics) for four day training	\$465,500
Cost to LEAs to provide leadership training	\$14,000

Cost to LEAs to provide content based professional learning in district settings @ 7 grants of \$7000 + 25% administration costs	\$61,250
Costs to LEAs to provide needs-based professional learning and presentations @ \$2000 per session X 24 presentations	\$48,000
Costs to LEAs for event planning, travel services, and accounting	\$35,000
<b><i>Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:</i></b>	
Avoidance of lawsuits regarding educational malpractice or under qualified teacher issues @\$50,000 (estimate 5 per year)	\$250,000
Avoidance of textbook purchases (now replaced by OER materials) @ 20 LEAs X 1000/students/LEA X \$85/textbook	\$1,700,000
<b><i>Summary of Costs and Benefits:</i></b>	
Total State Expenditures (State funds and section costs): \$175,838	
Estimated cost savings: \$1,950,000	
Estimated alternative service costs: \$800,200	
Net Benefit of position to state: \$2,574,362	

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Public Affairs**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- **Provide notice of public meetings** of Utah State Board of Education and other appropriate organizations under the State Board (e.g., Charter School Board, State Rehabilitation Counsel, Utah Professional Practices Commission) in accordance with UCA 52-4-402 (Open and Public Meetings Act).
- **Prepare and distribute State Superintendent of Public Instruction's annual report** in accordance with UCA 53A-1-301 (Administration of Public Education).
- **Record and make available audio portions of meetings** of Utah State Board of Education and Utah State Charter School Board in accordance with UCA 52-4-203 (Open and Public Meetings Act).
- **Promulgate new policies, policy changes, and direction of the Utah State Board of Education** through all useful communication channels to appropriate audiences.
- **Promulgate Utah public school student performance and financial data** through all useful communication channels to appropriate audiences.
- **Assist government agencies, media outlets, researchers and the general public** in finding and understanding school performance and financial data related to Utah's public school system.
- **Monitor institutional and public reaction** to Utah's public education system.
- **Intervene in public discussions when there are inaccuracies** about Utah's public school system.
- **Ensure elected policy makers and appointed policy enactors are aware** of public concerns, questions, or compliments about Utah's public school system.
- **Provide public relations counsel** to Utah State Board of Education members and agency personnel.
- **Apprise agency personnel** of work-related resources and directives that apply to them.
- **Assist local education agencies and related public education groups** (e.g., school principal groups, school superintendent groups, Utah Education Network) with public relations-related work as needed.
- **Work with public affairs representatives from other state agencies** as needed.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Provide notice of public meetings of Utah State Board of Education and other appropriate organizations under the State Board in accordance with UCA 52-4-402 (Open and Public Meetings Act).
- Record and make available audio portions of Utah State Board of Education and Utah State Charter School Board meetings in accordance with UCA 52-4-203 (Open and Public Meetings Act).

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Preparation and distribution of State Superintendent of Public Instruction's annual report in accordance with UCA 53A-1-301 (Administration of Public Education)

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- **Meeting notices** of the Utah State Board of Education and other boards and committees that

serve under the Board fulfill the obligations of Utah’s Open and Public Meeting Act. The public is informed of the meetings, may participate in the meetings either in person or electronically, and learn of the results of the meeting.

- **Public is informed** of the status of Utah’s public education system through the Superintendent’s Annual Report and supplemental documents stored on the agency’s website.
- **Electronic and printed materials are developed** about Utah’s public education system to inform the public today and to provide an historical record for future generations.
- **Two-way communication between the public and elected leaders is facilitated** through dissemination of information from the Board and in monitoring efforts from public sources.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 49,057
• Federal Funds	\$
• Other (Describe): Transfer, Fed Min Lease	\$ 336,873
Total Funding	\$ 385,930

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 348,523
• Travel Expenses	\$ 42
• Current Expenses	\$ 37,365
• Other Charges	\$ 0
Total Costs	\$ 385,930

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- **Utah State Board of Education and Utah State Superintendent of Public Instruction would be out of compliance with Utah statute** for not providing meeting notice or publishing an annual report. Cost of lawsuits if statute is not filed: Estimate between \$60,000 - \$100,000 to defend.
- **Utahns would have less access to and less understanding** of their public education system.
- **Utah State Board of Education members and Utah State Office of Education staff would have no systematic way of learning about public discussions** of the public education system.
- **Utahns would have a much smaller historical record** about their public education system.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

**\$1,679,868.75 to \$2,042,368.75** which represents actual costs of \$1,343,895 to \$1,833,895 plus a 25 percent premium representing familiarity with the work and the client that an outside agency would lack.

- Outsourced public relations work @ \$95 - \$300 per hour (typical cost in Salt Lake market) x 2000 hours per year (2080 hours minus two weeks’ vacation) = \$190,000 - \$600,000.
- Outsourced news clipping services for print media at \$75 per month and \$0.75 per article (typical cost in Salt Lake market) @ an average of 560 clips per month = \$495.
- Outsourced broadcast clipping service at a flat fee of \$100 per month = \$100.
- Outsourced graphic arts design @ \$60 - \$100 per hour x 2000 hours per year (2080 hours minus two weeks’ vacation) = \$120,000 - \$200,000.
- Outsourced studio services plus technician @ \$500 per hour (typical cost in Salt Lake market) x 2000 hours per year (2080 hours minus two weeks’ vacation) = \$1 million.

- Outsourced editor @ \$22.50 per hour (typical national rate since editing can be done electronically) times 1480 hours (1560 minus two weeks' vacation) = \$33,300.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***  
**\$1,293,938.75 to \$1,653,438.75**

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

Costs for LEAs to research changes in policy. Costs for LEAs for not following policy because of changes they didn't know about. Costs for others (government agencies, general public) seeking information that would no longer have assistance. Costs estimated for local education agencies (LEA) with student populations in excess of 10,000 to hire a public affairs manager to track policy communication functions now handled at state level: \$83,410 for salary and benefits for a government public affairs director (private salary and benefits estimated at \$105,690, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics "National Occupational employment and Wage Estimates"). \$83,410 x 16 LEA = \$1,334,560.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Having a public relations function including audio/video production services in house saves Utah about \$2.6 million and better serves the needs of the public education system and the public generally.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Children's Trust  
Program: School LAND Trust Program**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Section fulfills the duties described in 53A-16-101.6, namely, protecting current and future beneficiary rights and interests in school trust lands and the permanent State School Fund, consistent with the state's perpetual obligations under the Enabling Act, Utah Constitution, state statute, and standard trust principles.

The section promotes productive use of school trust lands and advocates on land policy issues as they affect public education funding. The section provides representation, advocacy, and input on behalf of the State Board, school community councils, schools, and school districts on land decisions to SITLA, the Legislature, the State treasurer, the Attorney General, and the public.

The section administers the School LAND Trust Program, distributing \$37.4 million in the 2013-14 school year to over 900 schools statewide.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Training of school community councils on their requirements under state code and state board rule. Compliance reviews on the School LAND Trust Program expenditures for 10% of the school districts and 10% of the charter schools in the state each year.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The section provides independent oversight on the prudent and profitable management of the trust and reports annually to the State Board of Education and the Legislature. (53A-16-101.6(9))

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The section was central to the creation of SITLA, the growth of the permanent State School Fund, and the creation and success of the School LAND Trust Program.

School community councils provide a real mechanism for local control, parental input with a real voice at each school, and a valuable feedback loop for school and district administrators. The section's advocacy on behalf of education helps ensure that the lands owned by the school kids are managed entirely and exclusively for the benefit of the beneficiaries.

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">Total Funding</p>	<p>\$536,000</p> <hr style="width: 10%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/> <p>\$536,000 (Interest and Dividends Account annual appropriation)</p>
---	---

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">Total Costs</p>	<p>\$445,073</p> <p>\$ 5,434</p> <p>\$85,493</p> <hr style="width: 100%;"/> <p>\$536,000</p>
---	--

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Without the efforts of this section, SITLA would not exist, nor would a sizeable permanent state school fund. Without this section, land management would likely be politicized in ways harmful to the beneficiaries, as has been seen in other states. The section has the primary responsibility to look after the interests of the beneficiaries of the fund, Utah’s children. In a weak budget period the permanent State School Fund is always a tempting target. The section represents the beneficiaries by advocating for them and seeing that funds are spent appropriately.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

The program provides over \$37 million annually directly to Utah schools. This is a significant source of education dollars. The section costs are less than 1.5 percent of that fund.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

Without the program, public education would incur a 1.2% funding loss. The funds help the state avoid higher taxes, or reduced services within the public education system.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

\$37 million in education dollars and the costs that may be incurred through mismanagement of unregulated trust funds at the school level.

**Benefit/Cost: 68**

Not including long-term benefits



**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance, Auditors/Accountants**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Local Education Agency (LEA) staff are trained and provided assistance with their financial reports and accounting by USOE financial auditors. LEA financial reports are collected, summarized and promulgated under the state and federal law, regulations and national mandates. In addition, USOE auditors staff the revolving loan programs.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

53A-3-404 (3) requires the USBE to publish financial data. Staff auditors collect the individual reports and summarize those reports to fulfill this requirement.

53A-15-202 requires the USBE to create standards for financial reporting. Staff auditors advise and implement the financial reporting standards and maintain documentation on how this is to be accomplished.

53A-16-103 requires the USBE to distribute funds. Some of the formulas contain data elements gathered through the new financial reporting system, Utah Public Education Financial System (UPEFS).

51-2a-202 Requires annual audits be sent to the USBE. Staff auditors are the recipients of these reports and create a repository and help analyze the reports to alert in case of problems noted.

51-7-11 The Money Management Council creates a listing of Qualified Depositories. LEAs' financial institutions are screened for compliance.

51-7-15, 51-7-17, 51-7-18.2 Staff auditors train LEA personnel on the requirements for public treasurers.

53A-19 Staff auditors provide training on budget requirements.

51-2a-201 requires audited financial statements be submitted to the board. Staff auditors receive, review and advise further action based upon the findings in these reports.

53A-21-401 & 53A-1a-522 creates revolving loan programs for both charter and districts. School Finance auditors staff and account for these funds.

EDGAR 34 CFR 76.561 allows indirect costs for LEAS to recover the additional administrative costs of operating Federal Grants. The staff auditors gather, verify and calculate the indirect cost rates for LEAs and check for compliance with federal guidelines.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Prepared and published are state financial reports by LEA by fund, function and object, providing an overview of school expenditures. Reports are also prepared for federal regulatory agencies, state programs and federal grants.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The audit/finance specialist position provides a repository of financial data and the ability to promulgate reporting standards as well as train new LEA staff members in financial reporting responsibilities. Also provided is the ability to present information in multiple formats and assist in monitoring activities required by state and federal requirements.

The collection of FY13 financial information was performed via the new Public Education Financial System (UPEFS). LEAs are able to upload detailed financial reports and to create various reports to comply with law.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$ See School Finance Summary
• Other (Describe):	\$
Total Funding	\$

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$
• Travel Expenses	\$
• Current Expenses	\$
• Other Charges	\$
Total Costs	\$

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

There would be no meaningful collection or interpretation of financial data for policy makers or the public. Spin doctoring of information would be increased and a lack of uniformity would be introduced into the state which would undermine efforts to provide sufficient information to any level of government or the public.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

\$6.4 million

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

There would be savings by eliminating the positions but because the functions need to be performed, the alternative costs would be much higher and still not give the expertise or interpretation of financial data needed.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

Significant costs would be incurred to aggregate and provide data to the Federal government and comparability would be lost. Using alternative sources to compile and interpret this data would run over \$400,000 per year. Even with this cost there would be a lack of interpretation and uniformity.

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

The positions are a very cost effective way to meet several legislative requirements for the USBE, thereby providing data and interpretation to the legislature and other external users of LEA financial data, including the federal government and the public. Failure to retain the positions would harm the uniformity and content of data being currently provided.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance, Auditors/Accountants**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Local Education Agency (LEA) staff are trained and provided assistance with their financial reports and accounting by USOE financial auditors. LEA financial reports are collected, summarized and promulgated under the state and federal law, regulations and national mandates. In addition, USOE auditors staff the revolving loan programs.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

53A-3-404 (3) requires the USBE to publish financial data. Staff auditors collect the individual reports and summarize those reports to fulfill this requirement.

53A-15-202 requires the USBE to create standards for financial reporting. Staff auditors advise and implement the financial reporting standards and maintain documentation on how this is to be accomplished.

53A-16-103 requires the USBE to distribute funds. Some of the formulas contain data elements gathered through the new financial reporting system, Utah Public Education Financial System (UPEFS).

51-2a-202 Requires annual audits be sent to the USBE. Staff auditors are the recipients of these reports and create a repository and help analyze the reports to alert in case of problems noted.

51-7-11 The Money Management Council creates a listing of Qualified Depositories. LEAs' financial institutions are screened for compliance.

51-7-15, 51-7-17, 51-7-18.2 Staff auditors train LEA personnel on the requirements for public treasurers.

53A-19 Staff auditors provide training on budget requirements.

51-2a-201 requires audited financial statements be submitted to the board. Staff auditors receive, review and advise further action based upon the findings in these reports.

53A-21-401 & 53A-1a-522 creates revolving loan programs for both charter and districts. School Finance auditors staff and account for these funds.

EDGAR 34 CFR 76.561 allows indirect costs for LEAS to recover the additional administrative costs of operating Federal Grants. The staff auditors gather, verify and calculate the indirect cost rates for LEAs and check for compliance with federal guidelines.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Prepared and published are state financial reports by LEA by fund, function and object, providing an overview of school expenditures. Reports are also prepared for federal regulatory agencies, state programs and federal grants.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The audit/finance specialist position provides a repository of financial data and the ability to promulgate reporting standards as well as train new LEA staff members in financial reporting responsibilities. Also provided is the ability to present information in multiple formats and assist in monitoring activities required by state and federal requirements.

The collection of FY13 financial information was performed via the new Public Education Financial System (UPEFS). LEAs are able to upload detailed financial reports and to create various reports to comply with law.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$ See School Finance Summary
• Other (Describe):	\$
Total Funding	\$

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$
• Travel Expenses	\$
• Current Expenses	\$
• Other Charges	\$
Total Costs	\$

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

There would be no meaningful collection or interpretation of financial data for policy makers or the public. Spin doctoring of information would be increased and a lack of uniformity would be introduced into the state which would undermine efforts to provide sufficient information to any level of government or the public.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

\$6.4 million

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

There would be savings by eliminating the positions but because the functions need to be performed, the alternative costs would be much higher and still not give the expertise or interpretation of financial data needed.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

Significant costs would be incurred to aggregate and provide data to the Federal government and comparability would be lost. Using alternative sources to compile and interpret this data would run over \$400,000 per year. Even with this cost there would be a lack of interpretation and uniformity.

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

The positions are a very cost effective way to meet several legislative requirements for the USBE, thereby providing data and interpretation to the legislature and other external users of LEA financial data, including the federal government and the public. Failure to retain the positions would harm the uniformity and content of data being currently provided.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance - School Construction Oversight and Training**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- UCA 53A-20-104 and R277-471 – Requires USOE oversight of school construction projects, ensuring they are designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE.
- UCA 53A-20.104.5 – Requires USOE to provide training during the “Annual Construction and Inspection Resource Conference,” which is accomplished during UFOMA (Utah Facilities Operations and Maintenance), Utah Association of Business Officials (UASBO), charter school training, and EdPAC conferences, as well as through technical assistance throughout the year for LEAs, School District Building Officials (SDBO), Charter School Board Building Officers (CSBBO), business administrators, school district superintendency, other state agencies, design professionals, contractors, and city and county personnel involved in public school construction and facility related safety.
- UCA 53A-20-103 compile the annual “School Plant Capital Outlay Report.”

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 10-9a et. seq.— Establishes rights, restrictions and requirements for school construction facilities when housed in municipalities having jurisdictional authority.
- UCA 15A et. seq – Establishes the building and fire code construction parameters school facilities must be constructed to.
- UCA 17-27a et. seq.— Establishes rights, restrictions and requirements for school construction facilities when housed in counties having jurisdictional authority.
- UCA 26-15-2 et. seq.—Establishes the minimum Utah State Health Department requirements public schools must follow regarding the design, construction, operation, sanitation and safety of school facilities.
- UCA 34A-7-101 et. seq.— Establishes the requirements for school mechanical systems as they fall under the jurisdiction of Utah State Boiler Inspector in Utah Labor Code.
- UCA 53A-3-414 et. seq.—Provides the responsibilities of local School Boards' when their buildings and grounds are used as civic centers.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—Outlines school construction requirements.
- UCA 53A-20-103 Outlines the requirements for the ‘School Plant Capital Outlay Report.’
- UCA 53A-20-104 Establishes process to administer and facilitate oversight, and ensure school construction is carried out with the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE.
- UCA 53A-20-104.5 Establishes the requirements for the ‘Annual Construction and Inspection Resource Conference.
- UCA 53A-22 et. seq.—Outlines the criteria for the construction of schools in districts with new industrial plants.

- UCA 58-56 et. seq.—Provides the minimum uniform building standards.
- Rule R156-56—Provides parameters that school facilities are constructed to obtain compliance with the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE.
- Rule R277-454—Establishes process when using the construction method of construction management (CM) for school building projects.
- Rule R277-471 Establishes procedures for the administration of school construction compliance.
- Rule R392-200—Provides parameters schools must follow for the design, construction, operation, sanitation, and safety of school facilities in relationship to the Utah Health Department.
- Rule R614-7—Outlines standards for construction.
- Rule R746-409—Establishes requirements for pipeline safety.
- Code of Federal Regulations, CFR Title 28 – 35.151; Title 28 – 36, subpart D; and the 2004 ADAAG – Department of Justice - Titles II and III of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 “ADA” in the Federal Register on September 15, 2010

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 10-9a et. seq.—Municipal Land Use Development and Management Act.
- UCA 15A et. seq – State Construction and Fire Code Act.
- UCA 17-27a et. seq. — County Land Use, Development, and Management Act.
- UCA 26-15-2 et. seq. —Minimum Rules of Sanitation Established by Health Department.
- Rule R392-200—Design, Construction, Operation, Sanitation, and Safety of Schools.
- UCA 53A-3-414 et. seq.— Local School Boards' Responsibility for School Buildings and Grounds When used as Civic Centers.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.— School Construction Requirements
- UCA 53A-20-103— School Plant Capital Outlay Report.
- UCA 53A-20-104 - Enforcement of Chapter by State Superintendent.
- UCA 53A-20-104.5 - School building construction and inspection manual -- Annual construction and inspection conference -- Verification of school construction inspections.
- UCA 53A-22 et. seq.— Construction of Schools in Districts with New Industrial Plants.
- UCA 58-56 et. seq.— Uniform Building Standards Act.
- Rule R156-56— Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454— Construction Management of School Building Projects.
- Rule R277-471 Oversight of School Inspections.
- Rule R392-200—Design, Construction, Operation, Sanitation, and Safety of Schools.
- Rule R614-7—Construction Standards.
- Rule R746-409—Pipeline Safety.
- Code of Federal Regulations, CFR Title 28 – 35.151; Title 28 – 36, subpart D; and the 2004 ADAAG – Department of Justice - Titles II and III of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 “ADA” in the Federal Register on September 15, 2010.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- School district and charter school personnel are trained in the latest adopted building codes,

state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE which assist not only compliance, to help reduce the possibility of life/safety issues, result in the most cost effective, appropriately designed and sized facilities and spaces for the particular school situation and needs.

- Various individuals are trained annually which assists those involved in construction and facility related matters understand what is required of them and apply it in practice:
  - UFOMA – 240 total individuals (120 – 2 times per year);
  - School Construction Procurement – on average 50 annually;
  - Design Professionals, Contractors, Vendors providing construction related services trained annually – 61 total.
- By receiving training charter schools and schools districts increase their knowledge and understanding of school construction and facility related matters, which helps reduce the need to procure services, resulting in reduced costs and increase efficiency.

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Total Funding</p>	<p><i>See School Finance Summary</i></p> <hr/>
---	--

***Section Costs:***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Total Costs</p>	<p>\$</p> <p>\$</p> <p>\$</p> <p>\$</p> <hr/> <p>\$</p>
--	---

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- LEAs would be required to retain construction management services and/or construction administration services, which would increase costs.
- If training and oversight of construction and facility safety were not provided, school facilities may not be constructed, renovated, and maintained meeting the minimum life/safety requirements set forth in building codes. The result may be injury and/or loss of life of occupants, lawsuits, unsuitable environments for students to learn effectively, and so forth.
- LEA personnel would require alternative means of being trained in the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual, which may require expanding additional funds to obtain.
- No entity would be empowered to receive and investigate complaints and impose sanctions regarding construction integrity, financial responsibility, facility safety, or violations of law or

rule specific to: (a) requirements and provisions; (b) LEA's or Program participant's compliance with any requirement of state or federal law or Board rule under the Program; (c) failure to comply with reasonable requests for records or information.

- Fraud would not be unavoidable, as USOE currently has the ability to verify construction and procurement adherence, whereas depending on the level of expertise of the School District Building Official (SDBO) or Charter School Board Building Officer (CSSBO), there may not be enough experience to understand proper processes or procedures without the assistance of USOE.
- Rural (low population) LEAs and Charter Schools and those involved in construction projects on a limited basis may experience a higher relative increase in administrative costs encompassed in replacing services of USOE, because of their dependence on USOE personnel expertise related to construction and facility safety.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- School districts and charter schools that employ individuals who have the skills to oversee the construction management (CM) duties of entire construction projects can save the cost or reduce the level of services needed to be procured, for example:
  - CM costs of 2.323% - 3.525% for projects with a budget between 1 and 10 million dollars, or a minimum of \$23,230 and a maximum of \$352,500
  - CM costs of 1.275% - 2.025% for projects with a budget between of 50 million dollars, or a minimum of \$12,750 and a maximum of \$202,500
- School districts and charter schools that employ individuals who have the skills to oversee the construction management tasks or portions of construction projects can save costs or reduce the level of services needed to be procured, for example:
  - Assisting in the procurement tasks: \$99.50 - \$138 – per hour
  - Construction Estimate Review: \$104.50 - \$137 – per hour
  - Project Management: \$99.50 - \$163 – per hour
  - Construction Meetings: \$99.50 - \$123 – per hour
  - Construction Invoice/Change Order Review: \$99.50 - \$123 – per hour
  - Construction Meeting Minutes: \$64 - \$105 – per hour

Note: Calculations based on state purchasing GC MA011, GCMA012 and GC MA013 Contracts for Consulting Services for Project Management.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- Construction Management Cost Avoidance for services provided in house for an entire construction project: between 2.323% for projects with a budget from 1 million or \$23,230 to 2.025% for projects with a budget of 50 million dollars or \$202,500
- Individual construction management task charges ranging from \$57.50 per hour for clerical services to \$184 – per hour for project executive tasks.

Note: Calculations based on state purchasing GC MA011, GCMA012 and GC MA013 Contracts for Consulting Services for Project Management.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

*See School Finance Summary*

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

*See School Finance Summary*

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance - School Construction Inspection**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 3 authorizes the State Board of Education to have general control and supervision of School Construction.
- UCA 53A-20 – Provide process to ensure that all school construction projects—after being designed by the appropriately licensed and certified individuals in accordance with the latest adopted building codes, state laws, administrative rules, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE—are built compliant and have received all necessary inspections and testing by appropriately certified and licensed individuals. The end result is that each construction project receives a permanent ‘Certificate of Occupancy’ with the assurance of preservation of life/safety.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—School Construction Requirements.
- Rule R23 et. seq. Administrative Services, Facilities Construction and Management.
- Rule R156-56—Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Construction Management of School Building Projects.

**State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:**

- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 3 authorizes the State Board of Education to have general control and supervision of School Construction.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—School Construction Requirements.
- Rules Title R23 et. seq. Administrative Services, Facilities Construction and Management.
- Rule R156-56—Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Construction Management of School Building Projects.
- Rule R277-471—Oversight of School Inspections.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- School districts and charter schools would either be required to go through the jurisdiction

having authority, which could potentially increase construction costs between 1 and 5%, which would add between \$1,000 for a project with a total estimated cost of \$99,999 being imposed a 1% fee to \$3,750,000 for a project, such as the new Herriman High School, with a total estimated cost for construction of \$75,000,000 being imposed a 5% fee.

- If school districts and charter schools were required to have oversight of their construction, similar to a jurisdiction having authority, the potential cost would vary, but would be the equivalent to one FTE, skilled in the field of construction, or to obtain services for this through independent inspecting agencies.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- School construction projects are inspections and testing by appropriately certified and/or licensed individuals in accordance with the latest adopted building codes, state laws, administrative rules, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE, resulting in facilities that are safe, comfortable, properly designed, appropriate for the education of students.
- The end result of each construction project receiving a permanent 'Certificate of Occupancy' helps to assure the preservation of life/safety.

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

- State Education Funds
  - Federal Funds
  - Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware
- Total Funding

*See School Finance Summary*

***Section Costs:***

- Personnel Costs
  - Travel Expenses
  - Current Expenses
  - Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)
- Total Costs

\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- Those charged with the responsibility of construction in school districts and charter schools may not understand compliance requirements, which could result in a loss of funds related to nonrefundable fine in the amount of one half of one percent of the total construction costs being assessed for those failing to report new or remodeling projects before construction begins.
- LEAs failing to meet or satisfy a school the school construction inspection requirement or

timeline designation under this R277-471 would have their total monthly Minimum School Program funds transfer process interrupted in the amount of:

- 10 percent of the total monthly Minimum School Program transfer amount the first month;
- 25 percent in the second month; and
- 50 percent in the third and subsequent months.

Interrupting funds would eliminate the LEAs to continue performing their duties, including providing an environment conducive learning.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

*See School Finance Summary*

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- Avoidance of a nonrefundable fine in the amount of one half of one percent of the total construction costs being assessed for failure to report the project before construction commences could be approximately \$500 (for a \$99,999 (the dollar threshold for reporting to USOE) total estimated cost project ) to \$375,000 (for a project such as the new Herriman High School with a total estimated cost for construction of \$75,000,000) and \$54,500 for a charter school (such as Weilenmann with School with a total estimated cost for construction of \$10,900,000). In the event that all of the school construction projects active in a one year period were assessed this fine this total amount to \$5,427,968.

Calculations based on the 'Annual School Plant Capital Outlay Report-FY11.'

- Avoidance of the interrupted funds, because of failure to report construction monthly could potentially be:
  - \$18,364 the first month (10%), \$45,909 the second month (25%), and \$91,818 every month thereafter (50%), based on a construction project being carried out in Daggett School District, who receives the least amount of total MSP funding of all school districts.
  - \$2,772,686 the first month (10%), \$6,931,716 the second month (25%), and \$13,863,432 every month thereafter (50%), based on a construction project being carried out in Granite School District, who receives the most in total MSP funding of all school districts.
  - \$3,550 the first month (10%), \$8,876 the second month (25%), and \$17,752 every month thereafter (50%), based on Uintah River High, who is the charter school receiving the least amount of total MSP funding for all charters.
  - \$85,330 the first month (10%), \$213,326 the second month (25%), and \$426,651 every month thereafter, based on American Preparatory Academy, who is the charter school receiving the most in total MSP funding.

Calculations based on MSP FY 12 Final information.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

- Potentially up to \$375,000 in nonrefundable fines for failure to report prior to construction commencing.
- Potentially up to \$13,863,432 of interrupted funding for failure to report monthly construction,

throughout the project.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

*See School Finance Summary*

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance – School Construction Procurement**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- Ensure that all school construction projects are completed in accordance with the latest school construction procurement requirements. Provide annual six-hour ‘School Construction Procurement and Certification’ jointly, with Utah State Purchasing to ensure at least one employee from each school district and public charter school involved in school construction is trained and receives a certificate indicating successful completion of the course.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—Establishes school construction requirements.
- UCA 63G-6a—Outlines requirements for school construction procurement code.
- Rules Title R23 et. seq. Provides process for using facilities construction and management construction methods.
- Rules Title R33 et. seq. Establishes purchasing requirements.
- Rule R156-56—Establishes requirements for building standards.
- Rule R277-454—Establishes criteria for construction management of school building projects.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—Establishes requirements for school construction.
- UCA 63G-6a —Establishes process for school construction procurements.
- Rules R23 et. seq. Outlines process for facilities construction and management.
- Rules R33 et. seq. Establishes requirements for purchasing services.
- Rule R156-56—Establishes requirements for adherence to the Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Defines the process of construction management of school building projects.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—School Construction Requirements.
- UCA 63G-6a —Utah Procurement Code.
- Rules Title R23 et. seq. Administrative Services, Facilities Construction and Management.

- Rules Title R33 et. seq. Administrative Services, Purchasing and General Services.
- Rule R156-56—Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Construction Management of School Building Projects.
- Rule R277-471—Oversight of School Inspections.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- By providing the training jointly with the Utah State Chief Procurement Officer, school district and charter school personnel, design professionals, contractors, vendors, and others involved in school construction are trained in proper procurement laws, rules, codes and guidelines which should result in not only compliance, but provide: for open competition, and obtain the most cost effective services.
- Approximate number of individuals trained annually:
  - UFOMA – 240 total (120 – 2 times per year)
  - School Construction Procurement – 50 annually on average
  - Design Professionals, contractors, vendors providing construction related services trained annually – 61 total

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

- State Education Funds
  - Federal Funds
  - Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware
- Total Funding

*See School Finance Summary*

---

***Section Costs:***

- Personnel Costs
  - Travel Expenses
  - Current Expenses
  - Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)
- Total Costs

\$

\$

\$

\$

---

\$

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- School districts and charter schools may violate laws, rules, codes and guidelines, which under current requirements would result in the loss or interruption of funds.
- Potential lawsuits and/or protest related to noncompliance can become not only quite costly, but cause delays, a loss of productivity, and hamper the ability to properly educate students.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- Although it is not possible to quantify potential added costs involved with failure to procure construction services following applicable laws, codes, and rules, the cost could be very substantial because of the large amount of funding used for school construction.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

*See School Finance Summary*

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

*See School Finance Summary*

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

*See School Finance Summary*

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance, Data Steward and Research Consultant**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- Data Steward: Oversee how pupil and teacher data specific to School Finance is defined, collected, stored, shared and reported. Work with D & S and IT staffs to provide context for the funding implications of technical decisions guiding what data is collected, reported, and analyzed. Assist D & S, IT, and Licensing staff in reviewing quality of student level data in UTREx and teacher data in CACTUS. Respond to school finance data requests.
- Compliance Monitoring: Collect, review and analyze independent student membership and fall enrollment audit reports of each LEA. Conduct CTE membership compliance audits for a third of LEAs each year. Provide technical assistance to LEAs about pupil accounting. Make recommendations for adjustments to data based on findings.
- Allocate Program Funds: Maintain ESEA allocation spreadsheet for Title I, Title IIA, Title III program funds. Verify and organize data to support allocation and provide to Federal Programs Section to use in Utah Consolidated Application. Administer Necessarily Existent Small Schools Program including application process, and maintenance of regression formulas to compute NESS Size and WPUs.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Maintains School Finance's portion of the State Administrative Board of Education Rule R277-419 Pupil Accounting which establishes standards for student membership data that is the basis for determining Weighted Pupil Units in the Minimum School Program as established in Utah Code 53A-17a-106.
- Maintain School Finance's portion of the State Administrative Board of Education Rule R277-486 Professional Staff Cost Program which establishes eligibility criteria and provides a mapping of technical data to the statutory formula established in Utah Code 53A-17a-107
- Maintain School Finance's portion of the State Administrative Board of Education Rule R277-445 Classifying Small Schools as Necessarily Existent which establishes standards and eligibility criteria for schools to receive funding under regression formulas established by the board and authorized by Utah Code 53A-17a-109
- Maintain School Finance's portion of the State Administrative Board of Education Rule R277-110 Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment and Utah Code 53A-17a-153 which outline educator categories eligible for salary increases.
- Maintain School Finance's portion of the State Administrative Board of Education Rule R277-459 Classroom Supplies Appropriation.
- Maintain School Finance's portion of the Utah Code 53A-11-301 by identifying how many WPUs to withhold from LEAs who have students who have not complied with the state immunization laws.
- Maintain School Finance's portion of the State Administrative Board of Education Rule R277-484 Data Standards which establishes timelines for data submissions often required for the timely distribution of funds

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Report (each spring) to U.S. Department of Education: State “Rural” Definition, Average Daily Attendance, Populations Density for Federal Eligibility determination of Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) grant awards.
- Report in November to the Utah Department of Health: Immunization Status Report of WPU to be decremented for noncompliance.
- Report to Utah State Auditor’s Office in the spring: changes to the State of Utah Legal Compliance Audit Guide APP C-5
- In December, compile school finance data to report to Governor and Legislature: Superintendent’s Annual Report (53A-1-301)
- By December 15 report School District Boundaries changes to US census School District Review Program
- -INTERNAL- Reporting Timeline
- Report in July and November to the MSP program Specialist: Year End MSP input data, Professional Staff FTEs, Educator Salary Adjustment FTEs, Classroom Supplies and Materials FTEs
- Report in spring, summer, and fall to Federal Programs department: ESEA allocation updates.
- Report in March to CTE financial coordinator CTE membership Audit findings

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- Minimum School Program (MSP) funds are distributed to LEAs on the basis that the Weighted Pupil Unit formula has been computed using accurate data. Allocation is as equitable and accurate as possible. LEAs are funded on the principle that state funds follow the student.
- LEAs are supported in recruiting and retaining highly educated and experienced educators for instructional, administrative, and other types of professional employment in public schools. Classroom teachers are directly supported in providing school supplies, materials or field trips to their students.
- Policy makers, LEAs, and other stakeholders are kept up-to-data and informed of funding implications and technical merits of data collection tools and methodologies.
- Funding-driven policy decisions are based on credible source data and informed by correct interpretation and context. Minimal adjustments are made to allocations because underlying data has been collected and applied in a way that supports the intent of the law.
- Student membership and fall enrollment data reported to USOE meet the standards of reliability and validity of official records of daily student attendance as required under Board rules (R277-419, R277-484) and USOE data specifications and validation rules.
- Educator data is used in accordance with state statute and rules (53A-17a-107, 53A-17a-153, r277-110, r277-486, etc.) which establish funding formulas and outline the distribution processes as determined by established eligibility criteria.
- Ensure a meaningful and continuous process that focuses on the verification of student membership data for the allocation of MSP funding.
- Ensure compliance with State Board, Utah State Code, and Federal rules and regulations.
- LEAs are supported in the process of evaluation and improvement of fiscal compliance and program effectiveness.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

- State Education Funds
  - Federal Funds
  - Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware
- Total Funding

*See School Finance Summary*

**Section Costs:**

- Personnel Costs
  - Travel Expenses
  - Current Expenses
  - Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)
- Total Costs

\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- Compromised Data quality leads to compromised funding process
- No transparency
- No trust

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

*See School Finance Summary*

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

*See School Finance Summary*

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

*See School Finance Summary*

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

***See School Finance Summary***

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 1 of the 2013 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance - Minimum School Program**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

One of the functions of the School Finance (SF) Section is the allocation of Minimum School Program (MSP) funds for Utah's forty-one school districts and eighty-five charter schools in accordance with the statutes and administrative rules governing the Public Education System. For FY13, approximately \$3.41 billion MSP funds will be distributed. There are approximately 46 line items in the Minimum School Program and each line item has a unique distribution method based on either Utah code or State Board rule.

Section personnel create the MSP budget in BASE, the Utah State Office of Education's (USOE) accounting system, in order to distribute the MSP funds in an appropriate manner. Accountability is ensured in following all local, state, and federal authority in distributing these funds. Section personnel create the MSP files and publish them both on the Internet so local education agencies (LEA) know what their monthly allotment will be. Questions from LEAs, regarding their distribution, are answered.

School Finance personnel provide professional development during three conferences that are held during the year. SF personnel also provide technical assistance to LEAs on the school finance process anytime throughout the year.

Interaction is made between the Utah State Office of Education (USOE), the State Tax Commission personnel, county assessors, auditors, treasurers, and school district business officials to develop estimated assessed valuations, redevelopment agency tax increments and associated valuations, and tax collections to determine school district tax levy proceeds and the amount of state guarantee funds.

During the legislative process, SF personnel also provide the Legislative Fiscal Analysts (LFA) office with fiscal note impact information for education-related bills that the LFA uses as a resource in developing final Legislative Fiscal Notes.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- 1) Enforce Utah Constitution Article X, Section 2 – defines that the public education system shall include all public elementary and secondary schools and such other schools and programs as the Legislature may designate. And states that all public elementary and secondary schools shall be free, except the Legislature may authorize the imposition of fees in the secondary schools.
- 2) Enforce Utah Constitution Article X, Section 3 – vests general control and supervision of the public education system in the State Board of Education.
- 3) Enforce Utah Constitution Article X, Section 5 – defines where the funds for the State School Fund and the Uniform School Fund will come from.
- 4) Enforce 53A-1a-513 – Funding for charter schools.
- 5) Rule R277-470 – Charter Schools

- 6) Enforce 53A-1a-1001 – UPSTART – a home-based educational technology program to develop school readiness skills of preschool children.
- 7) Enforce 53A-2-206 – Interstate compact students – Inclusion in attendance count – Funding for foreign exchange students.
- 8) Enforce 53A-15-101 – Higher Education Courses in the Public Education System.
- 9) R277-703 – Centennial Scholarship for Early Graduation.
- 10) Enforce 53A-15-104 - Critical Languages Program.
- 11) R277-488 – Critical Languages Program.
- 12) Enforce 53A-15-105 – Dual Language Immersion Program.
- 13) Enforce 53A-16-101 et seq. – Provides for State Financing of Public Education – including 53A-16-101.5 which provides for fund allocations and reporting requirements for the School LAND Trust Program.
- 14) R277-477 – Distribution of funds from the Interest and Dividend Account (School LAND Trust Funds) and Administration of the School LAND Trust Program.
- 15) Enforce 53A-17a-101 et seq. – Chapter 17a “Minimum School Program” requires the State Board of Education to administer MSP programs.
  - a. Rule R277-110—Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment.
  - b. Rule R277-407—School Fees.
  - c. Rule R277-422—State Supported Voted Leeway, Local Board-Approved Leeway and Local Board Leeway for Reading Improvement Programs.
  - d. Rule R277-423—Delivery of Flow-Through Money.
  - e. Rule R277-424—Indirect Costs for State Programs.
  - f. Rule R277-436—Gang Prevention and Intervention Programs in the Schools.
  - g. Rule R277-437—Student Enrollment Options.
  - h. Rule R277-445—Classifying Small Schools as Necessarily Existent.
  - i. Rule R277-459—Classroom Supplies Appropriation.
  - j. Rule R277-460—Distribution of Substance Abuse Prevention Account.
  - k. Rule R277-467—Distribution of Funds Appropriated for Library Books and Electronic Resources.
  - l. Rule R277-470—Charter School Financial Practices and Training.
  - m. Rule R277-478—Block Grant Funding.
  - n. Rule R277-484—Data Standards.
  - o. Rule R277-485—Loss of Enrollment.
  - p. Rule R277-486—Professional Staff Cost Program.
  - q. Rule R277-489—Early Intervention Program.
  - r. Rule R277-490—Beverly Taylor Sorenson Elementary Arts Learning Program.
  - s. Rule R277-492—Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative (USTAR) Centers Program.
  - t. Rule R277-504—Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, Special Education (K-12), Communication Disorders, Speech-Language Pathologist and Speech-Language Technician, and Preschool Special Education (Birth-Age 5) Licensure.
  - u. Rule R277-600—Student Transportation Standards and Procedures.
  - v. Rule R277-601—Standards for Utah School Buses and Operations.
  - w. Rule R277-612—Foreign Exchange Students.
  - x. Rule R277-703—Centennial Scholarship for Early Graduation.
  - y. Rule R277-706—Public Education Regional Service Centers.
  - z. Rule R277-708—Enhancement for At-Risk Students Program.
  - aa. Rule R277-709—Education Programs Serving Youth in Custody.
  - bb. Rule R277-713—Concurrent Enrollment of High School Students in College Courses.

- cc. Rule R277-725—Electronic High School.
- dd. Rule R277-733—Adult Education Programs.
- ee. Rule R277-735—Corrections Education Programs.
- ff. Rule R277-750—Education Programs for Students with Disabilities.
- gg. Rule R277-751—Special Education Extended School Year.
- hh. Rule R277-911—Secondary Career and Technical Education.
- 16) Enforce 53A-21 et seq. – Public Education Capital Outlay Act.
- 17) Enforce 59-2-902 – Minimum Basic Tax Levy for School Districts.
- 18) Enforce 59-2-905 – Legislature to set Minimum Rate of Levy for State’s Contribution to Minimum School Program.
- 19) Enforce 59-2-906 – Rates Fixed by Commission Valid.
- 20) Enforce 59-2-919 – Notice, Public Hearing, and Resolution Requirements for Certain Tax Increases.
- 21) Enforce 59-2-924 – Report of Valuation of Property To county Auditor and Commission

**State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:**

Although there aren’t any statutorily required requirements for reporting the MSP funding allocations, the USOE issues monthly allotment memos that tell the LEAs how much their budgets are in the 40 state funded programs. These allotment memos also let the LEAs know how much federal and other state funding they are to receive. SF personnel also publish the MSP funding spreadsheets to the internet.

Through the BASE accounting system, we are able to give the LEAs yearly reports to show how much funding the LEA has actually received.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$199,488
• Federal Funds	\$
• Other (Describe):	\$
Total Funding	<hr/> \$199,488

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs (2 FTEs)	\$199,488
• Travel Expenses	\$
• Current Expenses	\$
• Other Charges	\$
Total Costs	<hr/> \$199,488

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

The LEAs would not receive their MSP funding and could not provide educational services to over 600,000 students.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

\$365,846 - see attached spreadsheet.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

\$521,100 – see attached spreadsheet.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

\$531,855 – see attached spreadsheet.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Gross Benefits	\$886,946
Net Cost Savings and Avoidance (Net Benefit)	\$692,175
Net Benefit per Dollar Spent	\$3.55
ROI	455.4%
Benefit/Cost	4.5

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance**

*See attached reports for: Online Courses, Transportation, School Finance Auditors, School Finance Data Steward, various construction functions and the Minimum School Program. Fund sources and expenditures are included in this document for these and the other school finance functions.*

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The School Finance Section is responsible for the calculation and distribution of over \$3 billion in State education funds, and the administration of some multi-million dollar programs. This is made possible by the tracking, collection, analysis, auditing and reporting of student-level, teacher-level, transportation, construction and financial data according to state and federal law, and national mandates. Staff members are experienced, well-educated in their respective areas of expertise, and willing to share their time and expertise with those from the public and private sectors.

**State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:**

See attached.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

See attached.

*All School Finance Programs:*

Analysis of information for Fiscal Notes  
Analyses for various public and private sector entities.  
Submission of financial reports to federal agencies.  
Distribution of state funds according to State law and USBE Rule.  
Oversight of various programs.  
LEA and other staff training.  
Working with IT staff to automate the Minimum School Program

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

See attached.

*All School Finance Programs*

- School Finance personnel with expertise in their respective fields provide LEA training, professional development and support free of charge
- Assistance, hardcopy and online reports are provided to public and private entities free of charge, with the exception of some GRAMA requests.
- School Finance staff provides expertise at costs lower than similar private industry positions

- Coordination with other state agencies lends expertise and address changes over time
- Policy makers, LEAs, other stakeholders and the public are apprised of funding implications and the technical merits of financial and statistical data collection tools and methodologies
- Analysis of scenarios and preparation of information for Fiscal Notes

***FY13 Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

• State Education Funds	\$ 1,353,766
• Federal Funds	<u>16,770</u>
Total Funding	<u>\$ 1,370,536</u>

***Section Costs:***

• Personnel Costs	\$ 1,243,515
• Travel Expenses	\$ 16,350 (state & fed)
• Current Expenses	\$ 100,671
• Other Charges	<u>\$</u>
Total Costs	<u>\$ 1,370,536</u>

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

School Finance staff provides expertise at average costs (\$43 per hour FTE including benefits) lower than similar private industry (\$43-\$150 per hour) positions for its various functions resulting in savings of \$2.4 million.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Millions in school construction and LEA financial compliance alone.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

The School Finance section has fourteen experienced FTEs at the average cost of \$43/hour including benefits, or private at \$43-\$150/hour results in a savings of \$2.4 million. In addition, efficiencies are experienced as staff from various sections is able to coordinate and communicate LEA and legislative issues that may arise, and prepare for the future. For example, changes in federal Special Education definitions prompt collection, reporting and enforcement changes, within the construct of federal and state legal compliance.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Benefits           \$2.4 million - \$50.0 million

Costs	\$1.37 million
Benefit/Cost	2.0 – 50.0

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance**

*See attached reports for: Online Courses, Transportation, School Finance Auditors, School Finance Data Steward, various construction functions and the Minimum School Program. Fund sources and expenditures are included in this document for these and the other school finance functions.*

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The School Finance Section is responsible for the calculation and distribution of over \$3 billion in State education funds, and the administration of some multi-million dollar programs. This is made possible by the tracking, collection, analysis, auditing and reporting of student-level, teacher-level, transportation, construction and financial data according to state and federal law, and national mandates. Staff members are experienced, well-educated in their respective areas of expertise, and willing to share their time and expertise with those from the public and private sectors.

**State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:**

See attached.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

See attached.

*All School Finance Programs:*

Analysis of information for Fiscal Notes  
Analyses for various public and private sector entities.  
Submission of financial reports to federal agencies.  
Distribution of state funds according to State law and USBE Rule.  
Oversight of various programs.  
LEA and other staff training.  
Working with IT staff to automate the Minimum School Program

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

See attached.

*All School Finance Programs*

- School Finance personnel with expertise in their respective fields provide LEA training, professional development and support free of charge
- Assistance, hardcopy and online reports are provided to public and private entities free of charge, with the exception of some GRAMA requests.
- School Finance staff provides expertise at costs lower than similar private industry positions

- Coordination with other state agencies lends expertise and address changes over time
- Policy makers, LEAs, other stakeholders and the public are apprised of funding implications and the technical merits of financial and statistical data collection tools and methodologies
- Analysis of scenarios and preparation of information for Fiscal Notes

***FY13 Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

• State Education Funds	\$ 1,353,766
• Federal Funds	<u>16,770</u>
Total Funding	<u>\$ 1,370,536</u>

***Section Costs:***

• Personnel Costs	\$ 1,243,515
• Travel Expenses	\$ 16,350 (state & fed)
• Current Expenses	\$ 100,671
• Other Charges	<u>\$</u>
Total Costs	<u>\$ 1,370,536</u>

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

School Finance staff provides expertise at average costs (\$43 per hour FTE including benefits) lower than similar private industry (\$43-\$150 per hour) positions for its various functions resulting in savings of \$2.4 million.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

Millions in school construction and LEA financial compliance alone.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

The School Finance section has fourteen experienced FTEs at the average cost of \$43/hour including benefits, or private at \$43-\$150/hour results in a savings of \$2.4 million. In addition, efficiencies are experienced as staff from various sections is able to coordinate and communicate LEA and legislative issues that may arise, and prepare for the future. For example, changes in federal Special Education definitions prompt collection, reporting and enforcement changes, within the construct of federal and state legal compliance.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Benefits            \$2.4 million - \$50.0 million

Costs	\$1.37 million
Benefit/Cost	2.0 – 50.0

## **Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE**

**(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

Section: School Finance  
Program: Pupil Transportation

Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:

Pupil transportation personnel have oversight of the safe and efficient to-and-from school transportation of approximately 190,000 students. These students are transported on 2,821 school buses with 3,047 certificated school bus drivers. Drivers receive 40 hours of original certification, 8 hours of annual In-service, and 4 hours of recertification from 102 certificated instructors who provide state generated curriculum according to State Standards for Utah School Buses and Operations. These instructors are certified in a five day course, and are required to complete one day of recertification each year. This instructor certification and recertification is provided by personnel each year.

The school buses are maintained and inspected under the same standards. The Standards are developed by the pupil transportation staff in concert with school district representatives, industry experts and national agencies and organizations. Approximately every five years these standards are approved by the Utah State Board of Education and the Utah Department of Transportation.

Pupil transportation personnel provide training, certification and professional development for directors, supervisors, instructors, bus shop technicians, and bus routing coordinators. They also provide pupil transportation technical assistance to superintendents, business officials, directors, supervisors, instructors, drivers, government officials and the general public.

Auditing of all aspects related to safe and efficient pupil transportation is conducted by pupil transportation personnel.

Personnel facilitate a statutory transportation advisory committee with representation from school superintendents, business officials, and school districts transportation supervisors to address transportation needs including recommended approved bus routes.

1)

State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:

Utah Code for Utah School Buses and Operations mirror the many requirements of Title 49 in the Code of Federal Regulations, and the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

41-6a-1304 School buses – Rules regarding design and operations.

53-8-211 Safety Inspection of school buses and other vehicles

53A-1-402 Board to establish minimum standards for public schools

53A-17a-126 State support of pupil transportation

53A-17a-127 Eligibility for state-supported transportation – Approved bus routes

State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:

Pupil transportation personnel collect data and prepare reports according to the requirements of the following state statutes and administrative rules:

- Pupil Transportation Schedule A1 Report 53A-17a-127 (3)(a)(i) &(ii), R277-484-3 (I)(a)
- Pupil Transportation Schedule B Report 53A-17a-127 (4)(b), R277-484-3 (I)(b)
- Pupil Transportation Schedule C Report 53A-17a-127 (3)(c), R277-484-3 (E)(9)(b)
- Pupil Transportation Schedule D Report 53A-17a-127 (3)(c), R277-484-3 (E)(9)(b)
- Pupil Transportation Schedule E Report 41-6a-1304, R277-484-3 (L)(2)
- Pupil Transportation Schedule F Report 53A-17a-127 (3)(c), R277-484-3 (E)(9)(a)

Benefits Provided by Program or Section:

Safe and efficient pupil transportation of approximately 190,000 students to and from school, and approximately 500,000 school children as needed to and from activity and field trips.

Studies conducted by the American School Bus Council indicate:

- Over \$40 million are saved annually by transporting our Utah School Children on school buses.
- Over 11 million gallons of fuel are saved each year, with over 86,000 fewer vehicles on the road.
- With each bus replacing 36 vehicles, traffic congestion is reduced and harmful particulate matter is reduced by thousands of pounds.
- Nationally for every 32,500 children transported, one life is saved each year. In Utah, that is at least five lives each year.

Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):

• State Education Funds	\$333,218
• Federal Funds	
• Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware	_____
Total Funding	\$333,218

Section Costs:

• Personnel Costs	\$319,987
• Travel Expenses	\$ 2,958
• Current Expenses	\$100,671
• Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)	_____
Total Costs	\$333,218

Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:

Families of over 32,000 students would need to provide other transportation for their students. Statewide, dollars would flow to less efficient transportation methods, resulting in a net decrease of household disposable income, and an increase in traffic congestion, pollution, property costs, accidents, and missed class time for late arrivals.

Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:

\$40 million in fuel and maintenance costs.

Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:

\$5 million loss of life.

Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:

Benefit/Cost:

1 - 300

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance - School Construction Oversight and Training**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- UCA 53A-20-104 and R277-471 – Requires USOE oversight of school construction projects, ensuring they are designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE.
- UCA 53A-20.104.5 – Requires USOE to provide training during the “Annual Construction and Inspection Resource Conference,” which is accomplished during UFOMA (Utah Facilities Operations and Maintenance), Utah Association of Business Officials (UASBO), charter school training, and EdPAC conferences, as well as through technical assistance throughout the year for LEAs, School District Building Officials (SDBO), Charter School Board Building Officers (CSBBO), business administrators, school district superintendency, other state agencies, design professionals, contractors, and city and county personnel involved in public school construction and facility related safety.
- UCA 53A-20-103 compile the annual “School Plant Capital Outlay Report.”

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 10-9a et. seq.— Establishes rights, restrictions and requirements for school construction facilities when housed in municipalities having jurisdictional authority.
- UCA 15A et. seq – Establishes the building and fire code construction parameters school facilities must be constructed to.
- UCA 17-27a et. seq.— Establishes rights, restrictions and requirements for school construction facilities when housed in counties having jurisdictional authority.
- UCA 26-15-2 et. seq.—Establishes the minimum Utah State Health Department requirements public schools must follow regarding the design, construction, operation, sanitation and safety of school facilities.
- UCA 34A-7-101 et. seq.— Establishes the requirements for school mechanical systems as they fall under the jurisdiction of Utah State Boiler Inspector in Utah Labor Code.
- UCA 53A-3-414 et. seq.—Provides the responsibilities of local School Boards' when their buildings and grounds are used as civic centers.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—Outlines school construction requirements.
- UCA 53A-20-103 Outlines the requirements for the ‘School Plant Capital Outlay Report.’
- UCA 53A-20-104 Establishes process to administer and facilitate oversight, and ensure school construction is carried out with the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE.
- UCA 53A-20-104.5 Establishes the requirements for the ‘Annual Construction and Inspection Resource Conference.
- UCA 53A-22 et. seq.—Outlines the criteria for the construction of schools in districts with new industrial plants.

- UCA 58-56 et. seq.—Provides the minimum uniform building standards.
- Rule R156-56—Provides parameters that school facilities are constructed to obtain compliance with the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE.
- Rule R277-454—Establishes process when using the construction method of construction management (CM) for school building projects.
- Rule R277-471 Establishes procedures for the administration of school construction compliance.
- Rule R392-200—Provides parameters schools must follow for the design, construction, operation, sanitation, and safety of school facilities in relationship to the Utah Health Department.
- Rule R614-7—Outlines standards for construction.
- Rule R746-409—Establishes requirements for pipeline safety.
- Code of Federal Regulations, CFR Title 28 – 35.151; Title 28 – 36, subpart D; and the 2004 ADAAG – Department of Justice - Titles II and III of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 “ADA” in the Federal Register on September 15, 2010

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 10-9a et. seq.—Municipal Land Use Development and Management Act.
- UCA 15A et. seq – State Construction and Fire Code Act.
- UCA 17-27a et. seq. — County Land Use, Development, and Management Act.
- UCA 26-15-2 et. seq. —Minimum Rules of Sanitation Established by Health Department.
- Rule R392-200—Design, Construction, Operation, Sanitation, and Safety of Schools.
- UCA 53A-3-414 et. seq.— Local School Boards' Responsibility for School Buildings and Grounds When used as Civic Centers.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.— School Construction Requirements
- UCA 53A-20-103— School Plant Capital Outlay Report.
- UCA 53A-20-104 - Enforcement of Chapter by State Superintendent.
- UCA 53A-20-104.5 - School building construction and inspection manual -- Annual construction and inspection conference -- Verification of school construction inspections.
- UCA 53A-22 et. seq.— Construction of Schools in Districts with New Industrial Plants.
- UCA 58-56 et. seq.— Uniform Building Standards Act.
- Rule R156-56— Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454— Construction Management of School Building Projects.
- Rule R277-471 Oversight of School Inspections.
- Rule R392-200—Design, Construction, Operation, Sanitation, and Safety of Schools.
- Rule R614-7—Construction Standards.
- Rule R746-409—Pipeline Safety.
- Code of Federal Regulations, CFR Title 28 – 35.151; Title 28 – 36, subpart D; and the 2004 ADAAG – Department of Justice - Titles II and III of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 “ADA” in the Federal Register on September 15, 2010.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- School district and charter school personnel are trained in the latest adopted building codes,

state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE which assist not only compliance, to help reduce the possibility of life/safety issues, result in the most cost effective, appropriately designed and sized facilities and spaces for the particular school situation and needs.

- Various individuals are trained annually which assists those involved in construction and facility related matters understand what is required of them and apply it in practice:
  - UFOMA – 240 total individuals (120 – 2 times per year);
  - School Construction Procurement – on average 50 annually;
  - Design Professionals, Contractors, Vendors providing construction related services trained annually – 61 total.
- By receiving training charter schools and schools districts increase their knowledge and understanding of school construction and facility related matters, which helps reduce the need to procure services, resulting in reduced costs and increase efficiency.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Total Funding</p>	<p>See School Finance Summary</p> <hr/>
---	---

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Total Costs</p>	<p>\$</p> <p>\$</p> <p>\$</p> <p>\$</p> <hr/> <p>\$</p>
--	---

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- LEAs would be required to retain construction management services and/or construction administration services, which would increase costs.
- If training and oversight of construction and facility safety were not provided, school facilities may not be constructed, renovated, and maintained meeting the minimum life/safety requirements set forth in building codes. The result may be injury and/or loss of life of occupants, lawsuits, unsuitable environments for students to learn effectively, and so forth.
- LEA personnel would require alternative means of being trained in the latest adopted building codes, state and federal laws, administrative rules, national mandates, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual, which may require expanding additional funds to obtain.
- No entity would be empowered to receive and investigate complaints and impose sanctions regarding construction integrity, financial responsibility, facility safety, or violations of law or

rule specific to: (a) requirements and provisions; (b) LEA's or Program participant's compliance with any requirement of state or federal law or Board rule under the Program; (c) failure to comply with reasonable requests for records or information.

- Fraud would not be unavoidable, as USOE currently has the ability to verify construction and procurement adherence, whereas depending on the level of expertise of the School District Building Official (SDBO) or Charter School Board Building Officer (CSSBO), there may not be enough experience to understand proper processes or procedures without the assistance of USOE.
- Rural (low population) LEAs and Charter Schools and those involved in construction projects on a limited basis may experience a higher relative increase in administrative costs encompassed in replacing services of USOE, because of their dependence on USOE personnel expertise related to construction and facility safety.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- School districts and charter schools that employ individuals who have the skills to oversee the construction management (CM) duties of entire construction projects can save the cost or reduce the level of services needed to be procured, for example:
  - CM costs of 2.323% - 3.525% for projects with a budget between 1 and 10 million dollars, or a minimum of \$23,230 and a maximum of \$352,500
  - CM costs of 1.275% - 2.025% for projects with a budget between of 50 million dollars, or a minimum of \$12,750 and a maximum of \$202,500
- School districts and charter schools that employ individuals who have the skills to oversee the construction management tasks or portions of construction projects can save costs or reduce the level of services needed to be procured, for example:
  - Assisting in the procurement tasks: \$99.50 - \$138 – per hour
  - Construction Estimate Review: \$104.50 - \$137 – per hour
  - Project Management: \$99.50 - \$163 – per hour
  - Construction Meetings: \$99.50 - \$123 – per hour
  - Construction Invoice/Change Order Review: \$99.50 - \$123 – per hour
  - Construction Meeting Minutes: \$64 - \$105 – per hour

Note: Calculations based on state purchasing GC MA011, GCMA012 and GC MA013 Contracts for Consulting Services for Project Management.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- Construction Management Cost Avoidance for services provided in house for an entire construction project: between 2.323% for projects with a budget from 1 million or \$23,230 to 2.025% for projects with a budget of 50 million dollars or \$202,500
- Individual construction management task charges ranging from \$57.50 per hour for clerical services to \$184 – per hour for project executive tasks.

Note: Calculations based on state purchasing GC MA011, GCMA012 and GC MA013 Contracts for Consulting Services for Project Management.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

*See School Finance Summary*

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

*See School Finance Summary*

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance - School Construction Inspection**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 3 authorizes the State Board of Education to have general control and supervision of School Construction.
- UCA 53A-20 – Provide process to ensure that all school construction projects—after being designed by the appropriately licensed and certified individuals in accordance with the latest adopted building codes, state laws, administrative rules, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE—are built compliant and have received all necessary inspections and testing by appropriately certified and licensed individuals. The end result is that each construction project receives a permanent ‘Certificate of Occupancy’ with the assurance of preservation of life/safety.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—School Construction Requirements.
- Rule R23 et. seq. Administrative Services, Facilities Construction and Management.
- Rule R156-56—Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Construction Management of School Building Projects.

**State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:**

- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 3 authorizes the State Board of Education to have general control and supervision of School Construction.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—School Construction Requirements.
- Rules Title R23 et. seq. Administrative Services, Facilities Construction and Management.
- Rule R156-56—Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Construction Management of School Building Projects.
- Rule R277-471—Oversight of School Inspections.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- School districts and charter schools would either be required to go through the jurisdiction

having authority, which could potentially increase construction costs between 1 and 5%, which would add between \$1,000 for a project with a total estimated cost of \$99,999 being imposed a 1% fee to \$3,750,000 for a project, such as the new Herriman High School, with a total estimated cost for construction of \$75,000,000 being imposed a 5% fee.

- If school districts and charter schools were required to have oversight of their construction, similar to a jurisdiction having authority, the potential cost would vary, but would be the equivalent to one FTE, skilled in the field of construction, or to obtain services for this through independent inspecting agencies.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- School construction projects are inspections and testing by appropriately certified and/or licensed individuals in accordance with the latest adopted building codes, state laws, administrative rules, ADA and the School Construction Inspection Resource Manual published by the USOE, resulting in facilities that are safe, comfortable, properly designed, appropriate for the education of students.
- The end result of each construction project receiving a permanent 'Certificate of Occupancy' helps to assure the preservation of life/safety.

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

- State Education Funds
  - Federal Funds
  - Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware
- Total Funding

*See School Finance Summary*

***Section Costs:***

- Personnel Costs
  - Travel Expenses
  - Current Expenses
  - Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)
- Total Costs

\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- Those charged with the responsibility of construction in school districts and charter schools may not understand compliance requirements, which could result in a loss of funds related to nonrefundable fine in the amount of one half of one percent of the total construction costs being assessed for those failing to report new or remodeling projects before construction begins.
- LEAs failing to meet or satisfy a school the school construction inspection requirement or

timeline designation under this R277-471 would have their total monthly Minimum School Program funds transfer process interrupted in the amount of:

- 10 percent of the total monthly Minimum School Program transfer amount the first month;
- 25 percent in the second month; and
- 50 percent in the third and subsequent months.

Interrupting funds would eliminate the LEAs to continue performing their duties, including providing an environment conducive learning.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

*See School Finance Summary*

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- Avoidance of a nonrefundable fine in the amount of one half of one percent of the total construction costs being assessed for failure to report the project before construction commences could be approximately \$500 (for a \$99,999 (the dollar threshold for reporting to USOE) total estimated cost project ) to \$375,000 (for a project such as the new Herriman High School with a total estimated cost for construction of \$75,000,000) and \$54,500 for a charter school (such as Weilenmann with School with a total estimated cost for construction of \$10,900,000). In the event that all of the school construction projects active in a one year period were assessed this fine this total amount to \$5,427,968.

Calculations based on the 'Annual School Plant Capital Outlay Report-FY11.'

- Avoidance of the interrupted funds, because of failure to report construction monthly could potentially be:
  - \$18,364 the first month (10%), \$45,909 the second month (25%), and \$91,818 every month thereafter (50%), based on a construction project being carried out in Daggett School District, who receives the least amount of total MSP funding of all school districts.
  - \$2,772,686 the first month (10%), \$6,931,716 the second month (25%), and \$13,863,432 every month thereafter (50%), based on a construction project being carried out in Granite School District, who receives the most in total MSP funding of all school districts.
  - \$3,550 the first month (10%), \$8,876 the second month (25%), and \$17,752 every month thereafter (50%), based on Uintah River High, who is the charter school receiving the least amount of total MSP funding for all charters.
  - \$85,330 the first month (10%), \$213,326 the second month (25%), and \$426,651 every month thereafter, based on American Preparatory Academy, who is the charter school receiving the most in total MSP funding.

Calculations based on MSP FY 12 Final information.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

- Potentially up to \$375,000 in nonrefundable fines for failure to report prior to construction commencing.
- Potentially up to \$13,863,432 of interrupted funding for failure to report monthly construction,

throughout the project.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

*See School Finance Summary*

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance – School Construction Procurement**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- Ensure that all school construction projects are completed in accordance with the latest school construction procurement requirements. Provide annual six-hour ‘School Construction Procurement and Certification’ jointly, with Utah State Purchasing to ensure at least one employee from each school district and public charter school involved in school construction is trained and receives a certificate indicating successful completion of the course.
- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—Establishes school construction requirements.
- UCA 63G-6a—Outlines requirements for school construction procurement code.
- Rules Title R23 et. seq. Provides process for using facilities construction and management construction methods.
- Rules Title R33 et. seq. Establishes purchasing requirements.
- Rule R156-56—Establishes requirements for building standards.
- Rule R277-454—Establishes criteria for construction management of school building projects.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—Establishes requirements for school construction.
- UCA 63G-6a —Establishes process for school construction procurements.
- Rules R23 et. seq. Outlines process for facilities construction and management.
- Rules R33 et. seq. Establishes requirements for purchasing services.
- Rule R156-56—Establishes requirements for adherence to the Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Defines the process of construction management of school building projects.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- UCA 53A-20-100.5 et. seq.—School Construction Requirements.
- UCA 63G-6a —Utah Procurement Code.
- Rules Title R23 et. seq. Administrative Services, Facilities Construction and Management.

- Rules Title R33 et. seq. Administrative Services, Purchasing and General Services.
- Rule R156-56—Utah Uniform Building Standards Act Rule.
- Rule R277-454—Construction Management of School Building Projects.
- Rule R277-471—Oversight of School Inspections.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- By providing the training jointly with the Utah State Chief Procurement Officer, school district and charter school personnel, design professionals, contractors, vendors, and others involved in school construction are trained in proper procurement laws, rules, codes and guidelines which should result in not only compliance, but provide: for open competition, and obtain the most cost effective services.
- Approximate number of individuals trained annually:
  - UFOMA – 240 total (120 – 2 times per year)
  - School Construction Procurement – 50 annually on average
  - Design Professionals, contractors, vendors providing construction related services trained annually – 61 total

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

- State Education Funds
  - Federal Funds
  - Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware
- Total Funding

*See School Finance Summary*

---

***Section Costs:***

- Personnel Costs
  - Travel Expenses
  - Current Expenses
  - Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)
- Total Costs

\$

\$

\$

\$

---

\$

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- School districts and charter schools may violate laws, rules, codes and guidelines, which under current requirements would result in the loss or interruption of funds.
- Potential lawsuits and/or protest related to noncompliance can become not only quite costly, but cause delays, a loss of productivity, and hamper the ability to properly educate students.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- Although it is not possible to quantify potential added costs involved with failure to procure construction services following applicable laws, codes, and rules, the cost could be very substantial because of the large amount of funding used for school construction.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

*See School Finance Summary*

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

*See School Finance Summary*

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

*See School Finance Summary*

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Finance**

**Program: Statewide Online Education Program**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory Provisions Fulfilled:***

- 53A-15-1201 et seq. - Enables eligible 9-12th grade students to earn high school graduation credit through publicly funded online courses.
- 53A-1a-104 (9) - The public education system uses technology to improve teaching and learning processes and for the delivery of educational services.
- 20 U.S.C. §1232h; 20 U.S.C. §1232g; 34 CFR Part 99 - Protecting privacy of student education records and specifically individually identifiable information including student or parent's first and last name; home or other physical address including street name and the name of the city or town, and telephone number. Enrollment records contain these elements plus special education and fee waiver status, and require secure storage and transmission.
- JR4-2-403 – Assists Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst in carrying out its responsibility to review and analyze the legislation to determine its fiscal impact.

***State/Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by Section:***

- 53A-15-1210 - Direct Providers to administer state-designated assessments consistent with R277-404 and R277-473 for identified courses using LEA-adopted and state-approved assessments.
- 53A-15-1213 - Establish procedures for the administration of a statewide assessment to a student enrolled in an online course.
- 53A-15-1006(2); 53A-15-1204(1) (b) - Determine space available standards and appropriate course load standards for online courses.
- 53A-15-1213; 53A-15-1208; 53A-15-1206.5 – Establish and administer a “Course Credit Acknowledgement” process allowing students to enroll in online courses.
- 53A-15-1209 – Establish and administer pupil membership rules allowing that student may not count as more than one FTE for funding purposes, unless the student intends to complete high school graduation requirements, and exit high school early, in accordance with the student's education/occupation plan (SEOP), for purposes of this program.
- 53A-15-1209 - Establish process ensuring that, except as provided in Subsection (5), a student enrolled in an online course may earn no more credits in a year than the number of credits a student may earn in a year by taking a full course load during the regular school day in the student's primary LEA of enrollment, unless this is allowed by the school district or charter school by means of an approval process.
- 53A-15-1206; 53A-15-1206.5; 53A-15-1207 - Withhold funds from primary LEAs of enrollment and make payments to Providers.
- **53A-15-1202(2) Provide for enrollment of Home and Private School students to** earn high school graduation credit through publicly funded online courses. Provide for payment of fees associated with Home and Private School student enrollment in publically-funded online courses.
- 53A-15-1204(3) - Administer an appeals process for students who request more online courses than specified in law and who are first denied by their primary LEA or school of enrollment.
- 53A-15-1207; 53A-15-1208; 53A-15-1216 - Refuse to provide funds under a CCA if the Board finds that information has been submitted fraudulently or in violation of the law or Board requirements.

- 53A-15-1207; 53A-15-1208; 53A-15-1216 - Receive, investigate complaints and impose sanctions, if appropriate, regarding course integrity, financial mismanagement, enrollment fraud or inaccuracy, or violations of the law or this rule specific to the requirements and provisions of this Program.
- 53A-15-1203(3)(b) - Provide high quality learning options for a student regardless of language, residence, family income, or special needs.
- 53A-15-1208(3); 53A-15-1206; 53A-15-301 - Facilitate oversight of and compliance with IDEA or Section 504 provisions for students taking online courses.
- 53A-15-1216 - Audit an LEA's or Program participant's compliance with any requirement of state or federal law or Board Rule under the Program.
- 53A-15-1216 - Impose penalties, withhold funds, or sanction Program participants for participants' failure to comply with reasonable requests for records or information.

***State/Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by Section:***

- 53A-15-1211(2)(a) - Scores aggregated by test on statewide assessments administered under Chapter 1, Part 6, Achievement Tests, taken by students at the end of an online course offered through the Statewide Online Education Program.
- 53A-15-1206(4)(c); 53A-15-1211(2)(b) - Percentage of the online course provider's students who complete online courses within the applicable time period.
- Percentage of the online course provider's students who complete online courses after the applicable time period specified in Subsection 53A-15-1206(4)(c) and before the student graduates from high school (53A-15-1211(2)(c) ).
- 53A-15-1211(2)(d).Pupil-teacher ratio for the combined online courses of the online course provider.
- JR4-2-403 – Provides requested factual input and analysis to Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst as it reviews legislation to determine its fiscal impact.

***State/Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by Section:***

- 53A-15-1211(2)(a) - Scores aggregated by test on statewide assessments administered under Chapter 1, Part 6, Achievement Tests, taken by students at the end of an online course offered through the Statewide Online Education Program.
- 53A-15-1206(4)(c); 53A-15-1211(2)(b) - Percentage of the online course provider's students who complete online courses within the applicable time period.
- Percentage of the online course provider's students who complete online courses after the applicable time period specified in Subsection 53A-15-1206(4)(c) and before the student graduates from high school (53A-15-1211(2)(c) ).
- 53A-15-1211(2)(d).Pupil-teacher ratio for the combined online courses of the online course provider.
- JR4-2-403 – Provides requested factual input and analysis to Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst as it reviews legislation to determine its fiscal impact.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- Access to: online learning options for 9-12<sup>th</sup> grade students; high quality learning options for a student regardless of language, residence, family income, or special needs; technology to customize education to allow a student to learn in the student's own style at own pace; technology skills, both in delivery and course content; competency-based instruction, assessment and completion of high school credit (especially useful for students attempting to

graduate early); individualized educational experience; technology to remove the constraints of traditional classroom learning (useful for students that cannot attend on traditional basis given illness, sports involvement, distance, professional commitments).

- Expanded: ability of students to customize their schedule to better meet the student's academic goals; options to prepare a student for post-secondary education and vocational or career opportunities.
- More efficient allocation of educational resources, especially useful for rural districts and those that might find it difficult to staff low-enrollment courses and to find highly qualified teachers for all courses.
- Progress to Date (1/21/14)
  - 2210 Enrollment requests facilitated as of 1/21/14 (mid-year, FY14):
  - 1596 unique students
  - 2086 credits requested, equivalent to 8344 quarter credits
  - 289 unique courses requested
- LEA staff (Charter School Business Managers and School Leaders, LEA Data Administrators, Registrars and Guidance Counselors, Curriculum Directors, Directors of Online Learning) trained in program statutes and applicable board rule.

***Implications if Section were not to provide noted functions or programs:***

- LEAs would be required to retain Program Specialist or increase duties of existing personnel to manage online course-level enrollments.
- LEAs would incur costs related to data storage and secure transmission.
- LEAs would be required to maintain business functions related to invoicing and payment distribution course-wise (multiple Provider LEAs, 139 Primary LEAs) corresponding to progress in course-level enrollments (multiple payments collected and disbursed per each enrolled credit).
- LEA personnel would require alternative means of being trained in changes in program statutes and State Board of Education Administrative Rules as these affect LEA activities and compliance.
- No entity would be empowered to receive and investigate complaints and impose sanctions regarding course integrity, financial mismanagement, enrollment fraud or inaccuracy, or violations of law or rule specific to: (a) requirements and provisions of this Program; (b) compliance with IDEA or Section 504 provisions for students taking online courses; (c) LEA's or Program participant's compliance with any requirement of state or federal law or Board rule under the Program; (d) failure to comply with reasonable requests for records or information.
- Administration of and accountability for required tests would be difficult or absent, without means for USOE to understand where and under what circumstances cooperating LEAs are (in real time) providing services to students.
- Fraud and error in payment would not be unavoidable, as USOE has the ability to check enrollment within each cooperating LEA, and to verify that students meet program requirements to be funded for online courses under program statutes, whereas a single LEA does not, nor could a contracted entity. USOE also has the unique ability to verify that some proportion of credit has been earned and reported to USOE for a course, before disbursement of funding, and to verify that funding requests are not submitted fraudulently.
- It is difficult if not impossible to envision a program providing choice of online services *administered by LEAs* to students across more than 100 charter and traditional LEAs without a central system for exchanging data, and payment, and a central secure data storage system accessible to LEA personnel. An entity other than USOE could only carry out cross-billing of LEAs similarly to the operation of a banking clearinghouse, because by statute MSP funds flow first to

the LEA, and outward for payments from that point. USOE has the statutory responsibility of receiving MSP allocations on behalf of LEAs, and re-allocating funds based on service provision - without necessity for cross billing and cross settlement. Most significantly, student data must be securely transmitted from LEA to LEA. Economies of scale effectively exist where a central entity that provides a secure data storage system accessible by personnel from all LEAs (and double at Provider LEAs, which also act as a Primary LEA to its own participating students) can provide necessary safeguards to students, and comply with federal regulations regarding security of student data. USOE can accomplish both functions at a cost extraordinarily lower than either (a) LEAs acting either alone or together, or (b) a commercial or contracted entity.

- Rural (low population) LEAs and Charter Schools may experience a higher relative increase in administrative costs encompassed in replacing services of USOE.

<b>Source and Amount of Funding</b>	
State Education Funds	\$250,000
Federal Funds	-
Other (Describe)	-
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>
<b>Costs</b>	
Personnel	80,438
Travel	1,367
Current	10,953
Other (Indirect)	12,522
<b>Total Program Costs</b>	<b>\$94,621</b>
<b>Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions</b>	
<b>Approximate Cost Avoidance</b>	<b>\$3,940,041</b>
Cost of FTEs for (a) online enrollment specialist and (b) accounting technician for each LEA having 9-12 <sup>th</sup> grade enrollment, prorated by level of enrollment overall; (c) secure data storage and transmission from LEA to LEA. FTEs valued using Utah Dept. of Human Resources Salary Schedules. (above)	
<b>Savings</b>	<b>\$398,307</b>
Estimated Alternative Costs (Savings) if the Section Functions or Programs were not Performed (traditional classroom delivery or external provider). (above)	
<b>Total System Savings from Section Functions</b>	<b>\$4,338,348</b>
<b>Gross Benefits</b>	<b>4,338,348</b>
<b>Net Cost Savings and Avoidance (Net Benefit)</b>	<b>4,088,348</b>
<b>Net Benefit per Dollar Spent</b>	<b>\$16.35</b>

ROI	1,635%
-----	--------

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: School Law and Legislation**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The School Law and Legislation Section provides the following services:

1. Draft, revise, file and maintain all Utah State Board of Education (Board) administrative rules as required or allowed by Utah statute.
2. Draft, review, and edit contracts, MOAs, MOUs, and other documents for USOE staff and local education agencies as requested.
3. Respond to GRAMA requests for the USOE.
4. Work with USOE Superintendency and USOE staff on new and revised legislation and consider implications for the Board, USOE, and local education agencies (LEAs).
5. Work with the State Attorney General's Office in addressing legal issues and litigation.
6. Provide support and professional development to public school personnel concerning current legal issues, public education law, educator discipline, professional standards, and legislation.
7. Work with other government entities including higher education, State Risk Management, state and local health departments, Division of Child and Family Services, and others to administer joint programs and carry out other statutory duties.
8. Provide information and direction to school districts, charter schools, other state agencies, and the general public on various issues including school fees, school First Amendment issues, student discipline, grading practices, ethics, and student confidentiality issues.
9. Revise and update school fee forms as necessary and complies all school fee certification of compliance forms.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The School Law and Legislation Section provides services consistent with the following state statutes:

1. Title 53A State System of Public Education, requirements for administrative rules (this includes rules for the Board, Utah State Office of Rehabilitation, Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission, and other entities under the supervision of the Board.
2. Title 63G, General Government, Chapter 3, Utah Administrative Rulemaking Act, for rulemaking responsibilities.
3. Title 63G, General Government Chapter 2 Government Records Access and Management Act, for responding to GRAMA requests.
4. Title 53A State System of Public Education, Chapter 6 Educator Licensing and Professional Practices Act, for required professional development.
5. Third Judicial District Court Permanent Injunction Order, 1994, for school fee waiver compliance.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

N/A

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

The School Law and Legislation Section provides the following benefits:

Work closely with and provide guidance to USOE staff to write and edit Board administrative rules and follow through with Board approval process and Division of Administrative Rules process until completion.

Provide information regarding Utah public education law and Board administrative rules to LEAs, other state agencies, the general public and anyone requesting the information; information is provided verbally, via email, in writing, upon request.

Draft, review, and edit training and professional development materials to USOE staff and local education agencies on: GRAMA, FERPA, open and public meetings, public employee and officers' ethics, school fees, residency, open enrollment, timelines for school programs, etc.

Draft, review and edit contracts, MOAs and MOUs as requested by USOE staff.

Provide professional development for licensed educators as a necessary requirement for educator license renewal.

Provide information relating to GRAMA requests; work with USOE staff and other agencies to fill GRAMA request and provide data and material consistent with the law.

**Source and Amount of Funding:**

State Education Funds	\$	277,500.00
Federal Funds		0
Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware		0
Total Funding	\$	277,500.00

**Section Costs:**

Personnel Costs	\$	221,681.76
Travel Expenses		2,726.43
Current Expenses		22,757.15
Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)		27,266.86
Total Costs	\$	274,432.20

**Implications if The Section Were Not to Provide the Above Noted Functions or Programs:**

Provisions for many of the functions for the School Law and Legislation Section are required by the Utah Code. Additionally, the Utah Constitution directs the Board to provide "general control and supervision" to the state public education system. If the Board/USOE did not provide oversight and assistance in public education matters to LEAs (now 41 school districts and 90+ charter schools) and work with other state agencies and governmental entities, there would be significant exposure and risk to the public education system. LEAs and other entities would have the burden—and in many cases lack the statewide vision and expertise—to provide oversight on issues now provided by the USOE School Law and Legislation Section. Undoubtedly, without the School Law and Legislation Section's work and anticipation of legal issues, there would be additional statewide and local lawsuits on such issues as funding equity for all public schools, compliance with state and federal constitutional rights for LEA employees and students, compliance with ethical and legal requirements for public education

employees, compliance with federal laws and regulations such as IDEA, NCLB, FERPA and FOIA and various other legally-related public education issues.

Also, the Board has administrative rulewriting responsibility, with all the requirements of regular review of rules, satisfaction of rulewriting timelines and interaction with the Division of Administrative Rules. The Board writes more rules than any other state agency or constitutionally authorized entity. The public education budget makes up approximately 50% of the state budget so rulewriting for programs and RFPs funded by the education budget is a critical responsibility. If rules are not written consistent with statutes or, in some cases, federal requirements, law suits, disorganization and lack of accountability for public funds would be likely. Failure to comply with federal regulations and state legislation through policy writing or rule writing could be costly and legally risky. Also, taxpayers have the right to know how public funds are spent, especially when they are spent on our children. Taxpayers also have a right to participate in the public oversight of education. Without the School Law and Legislation Section, the following duties and services would be problematic:

1. Board Rule development, regular review and implementation, as required by Utah law;
2. The review of internal documents with legal implications such as MOUs, MOAs, and reports to state, federal and local governmental entities;
3. Appropriate professional development and assistance to LEAs
4. Information and answers to basic questions that require reading and reviewing statutes and administrative rules about such topics as public education funding, proposed legislation, parent choice in education, teacher licensing and student safety;
5. Findings of noncompliance by federal entities or for state or federal programs. Such findings could result in loss of funds or revenue, discontinuation of services to public schools or orders by federal agencies that would affect public education funding and/or services.
6. Inadequate oversight and review. This oversight was critical when there were 40 traditional school districts ten years ago. There are now 41 traditional school districts, many thousands of additional Utah school children, almost 100 charter schools and approximately 10 additional public school programs (Carson Smith Scholarship program, State Online Education, Electronic High School, multiple experimental pilot programs) that receive state funding similar to the direct funding that school districts received 10 years ago.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

It is difficult to quantify the potential costs of noncompliance, failure to establish standards through rulemaking and failure to provide information about programs that increase effectiveness, safety and availability of public education programs and opportunities for children.

During 2013, the USOE, on behalf of the Board, took more than 100 rulemaking actions. These included developing amendments, writing rules, and reviewing responses to Board Rules from other entities and individuals. In addition, the School Law and Legislation Section staff worked with legislators and policy makers to consider rulemaking as part of new and amended legislation. These numbers do not include the many discussions and reviews of rules by School Law and Legislation Section staff when we determined that rulemaking was not necessary or when local policy changes were recommended instead of rulemaking.

If this work had not been accomplished by the one attorney/educator with assistance from another attorney/educator and one very experienced near-legal secretary, the work would have to be accomplished by as many as three attorneys (other state agencies), paralegals and administrative assistants. Due to extensive rewrites of several complicated rules, the rule-writing workload increased from 2012 to 2013. The rule-writing workload usually increases annually. This estimated cost is conservatively estimated at: \$200,000 for salary/benefits for each of three attorneys (\$600,000); \$125,000 for one paralegal trained in public education funding and issues and \$80,000 for one legal secretary—for a total of \$805,000 for the Administrative rule-writing function of the Law and Legislation section.

The USOE School Law and Legislation Section provides professional development and training, as directed by Board/USOE leadership, statute, and upon request. To illustrate, during the 2013 calendar year, the Law and Legislation staff worked with other office specialists to prepare and provide training about financial and ethical practices in LEA athletic and activity programs. These presentations were developed previously but were continued in approximately six to eight venues in 2013. Significant travel by USOE staff was required for some of the presentations. If each LEA prepared its own presentation materials or paid for the presentation, a conservative estimate of in-house costs per LEA would be about \$500 per LEA. If travel time, preparation time and expertise are included in the cost of the training, it is estimated that the statewide cost would be \$62,000—on just one issue!

The School Law and Legislation Section provides training by two staff attorneys upon request. Training is provided at least once per week on topics as diverse as student constitutional rights, FERPA, open meeting requirements, public educator ethics, copyright laws, GRAMA and school equity. Each session requires preparation, legal interpretation of state laws and administrative rules, and a technical format—and takes from three to 10 hours of a staff attorney's time. Often the presentations require one or two hours of assistance from technical staff. If an attorney's presentation time is valued at \$400/hour, preparation time at \$200/hour and an assistant's time at \$50/hour, an average presentation cost at approximately \$1,450 per presentation—x 40 presentations per year for a total cost of \$58,000 annually for professional development and training provided to LEAs and other groups.

The School Law and Legislation Section also provides information about state and federal education laws and programs via telephone, email and mail. The USOE staff does not provide legal advice but does help LEAs find legal information upon request. The responses to questions are fielded by two staff attorneys and one very experienced administrative assistant. An average response takes between 15 minutes and one hour, depending upon the complexity of the request or question. Each attorney responds to approximately (and conservatively) 10 questions per day. The administrative assistant responds to at least five questions per day. If these responses were paid for in the private sector, the cost per day could be estimated at six hours/day X \$300 per attorney hour + two and one half hours per day X \$50/hour administrative assistant time = \$125.00 + \$1,800 for a total of average daily expense to respond to taxpayers of \$1,925 day—for School Law and Legislation Section staff. An average work year equals 200 days X \$1,925/day or \$385,000 annually to be responsive to taxpayers, public education employees, other government agencies and policy makers.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

The USOE provides assistance to public education generally, to LEAs and to taxpayers and policy makers. Only seven of the 41 public school districts have in-house attorneys. Of the 95 charter schools,

approximately 10-15 have access to legal assistance. Of the 10-15 lawyers that work with charter schools, few have any training or experience with public education issues. Most of the policy making agencies that the USOE work with—including state legislative staff, state agencies and federal programs—have attorneys that work with them. It is both more effective and helpful for the USOE to have staff attorneys with personal experience as public educators to interact with other staff attorneys.

The USOE has been a named plaintiff in lawsuits. When USOE staff members are named individually, the USOE as an entity and/or the Board—we are represented by Utah Assistant Attorneys General. The Assistant AGs work closely with USOE staff attorneys who gather documents, prepare witnesses, and provide information at no additional cost to the Utah Attorney General’s Office. Additionally, because the USOE staff attorneys actively provide information to LEAs and individuals, some of whom are looking for reasons to sue LEAs, we believe that we avoid an impossible-to-estimate number of lawsuits—large and small. If the average lawsuit costs between \$5,000 and \$75,000, avoiding three nominal lawsuits and one major lawsuit annually (a realistic estimate) results in a savings of almost \$100,000 annually to Utah taxpayers. This money can then be used in public education classrooms.

The USOE costs for one attorney full time for School Law and Legislation and one attorney who devotes about 20% of her time to School Law and Legislation issues and one full-time administrative assistant are approximately \$250,000. Due to the legal expertise and the public education expertise of the School Law and Legislation Section staff, the same work would have to be accomplished by at least one experienced educator (\$80,000 annually), an administrative assistant or a paralegal (\$50,000–\$125,000 annually), and at least two full time attorneys (\$200,000 annually for each attorney). This would be a total annual cost in the private sector of almost \$600,000 annually for the services provided by the Law and Legislation staff—in activities of staff that are quantifiable as to cost avoidance. What is the cost avoidance value of taxpayers who better understand the requirements of a school bond election? What is the cost avoidance of a teacher or several teachers who, upon learning of their rights to academic freedom and freedom of expression, determine not to sue their employing charter school? What is the cost avoidance of statewide financial and ethical training for coaches that helps coaches more accurately manage public funds?

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs Were Not Performed:***

Alternative costs listed above as private attorneys and legal assistants and necessary resources to provide services would need to be redirected from schools and classrooms to perform the tasks now being performed by the USOE School Law and Legislation Section.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Benefits:	\$ 1,910,000.00
Costs:	\$ 274,432.20
Benefit/Cost:	7.0

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Secondary English/Language Arts**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Secondary English Language Arts Specialist in the department of Teaching and Learning is responsible for providing leadership to secondary English language arts teachers across the state and carrying out functions related to the following Board rules: R277-700, The Elementary and Secondary School Core Curriculum; Rule R277-700-5, Middle School Education Requirements; R277-700-6, High School Requirements; and R277-700-8, Student Mastery and Assessment of the Core Curriculum Standards and Objectives (B, C, D). These duties include but are not limited to:

- Monitoring Endorsements in English, Speech, and Journalism through evaluation of transcripts and recommendations for knowledge gaps for highly qualified teachers not yet highly qualified in subject area content or content specific exams as delineated by federal law (administered by the Educational Testing Service = PRAXIS Exams) (R277-502);
- Supporting twenty-three to thirty teachers on State Approved Endorsement Plans so that they can become highly qualified within two years (R277-510-5);
- Designing and implementing demonstrated competency protocols for each course in all three endorsements (R277-502);
- Supporting Utah educators and districts in the development of curriculum to be used in grades 6-12 in English Language Arts courses, both core curriculum for the English graduation requirement, and also over 40 elective courses ranging from communication, broadcasting and debate to Creative and Expository Writing; and approval of course syllabus for newly developed concurrent courses at the college level (Rule 277-700);
- Coordinate the statewide WestEd Initiative with 14 districts and 22 high school teams in content literacy: English, Science, and Social Studies as a support for the High School Accreditation process (R277-413);
- Collaboration with assessment department to design online content based UTIPS assessments for pre and post-tests (R277-404-3);
- Work with statewide dropout prevention committee to provide a statewide plan and action for early interventions so students complete their k-12 education (R277-436)
- Implement training for district teacher leaders and teachers – including all university personnel who teach courses for the English endorsement programs and professors in the English majors departments (Summer 2011 = 1500 secondary teachers in English in grades 6-12);
- The evaluation of instructional materials, textbooks and Open Source materials and recommendations to districts as appropriate for use in secondary classrooms and supporting the Instructional Materials Commission Operating Procedures(R277-469-6);
- Approval and monitoring of all professional development offered by every district and charter

school for educator in-service procedures and credit for re-licensure and ongoing development in content expertise and effective instruction (R277-519-4);

- Support the development of the secondary English curriculum in the Electronic High School (R277-604- 5; R277-725);
- Responding to district questions about graduation requirements related to course codes and aligned curriculum as well as NCAA course approval.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Monitoring Endorsements in English, Speech, and Journalism through evaluation of transcripts and recommendations for knowledge gaps for highly qualified teachers not yet highly qualified in subject area content or content specific exams as delineated by the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Utah Code section 53A-6 and Board rule R277-502.
- Supporting twenty-three to thirty teachers on State Approved Endorsement Plans so that they can become highly qualified within two years (53A-6, R277-502, and R277-510-5).

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Annual Performance Plans with student impact and cost analysis for on-going evaluation procedures.
- Contribute to report for federal ESEA Title IIA highly qualified report through work with ELA teacher endorsements.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- Ensuring highly qualified statutes are implemented for English, Speech, and Journalism (R277-502);
- Ensuring quality of demonstrated competency all three endorsements (R277-502);
- Ensuring completion of statewide WestEd Initiative with 14 districts and 22 high school teams in content literacy: English, Science, and Social Studies as a support for the High School Accreditation process (R277-413);
- Ensuring high quality training for district teacher leaders and teachers – including all university personnel who teach courses for the English endorsement programs and professors in the English majors departments (Summer 2011 = 1500 secondary teachers in English in grades 6-12);
- Ensuring appropriate instructional materials, textbooks and Open Source materials are recommended to 41 districts and 85 charter schools for use in secondary classrooms and supporting the Instructional Materials Commission Operating Procedures (R277-469-6);
- Ensuring all professional development offered by every district and charter school for educator in-service procedures and credit for re-licensure and ongoing development in content expertise and effective instruction (R277-519-4).

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Appropriation Funds	\$ 182,043
Total Funding	\$ 182,043

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$123,663 (salary and benefits)
• Travel Expenses	\$ 1,861
• Current Expenses	\$ 1,998 (Phone and rent)
• Program	\$ 54,521
Total Costs	\$ 182,043

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- Programs and regulations outlined in Utah Code and Board rule would not be implemented along with noncompliance to federal mandates for highly qualified teachers.
- Support for rural schools in implementing state approved curriculum would be limited.
- Collaborative partnerships with university teacher education programs, Salt Lake Community College, and English majors programs would not exist.
- Online digital resources as well as online educational opportunities for both teachers and students in content literacy that are Open Source and no cost to educators and families would not be developed or implemented.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

- This position provides professional development and resources to LEAs, including charters and rural districts who do not have the capacity to develop and provide said resources. The cost of providing professional development to LEAs is approximately \$113,000. This does not include the time and resource development connected to this particular position. LEAs would need to provide FTE (approx. \$80,000 including benefits) and additional funding for developing and providing face to face and online professional development (approx. \$150 per teacher). Multiply this by 41 districts and 85 charters and the cost savings is **\$10,800,000** by them not having to hire FTE alone to provide support for endorsements, professional development for new Utah ELA Core standards, and ongoing resource development.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

- By employing a secondary language arts specialist, USOE is able to monitor highly qualified teaching and the ongoing development of teachers to better address the needs of all learners

in secondary English, Speech and Journalism as career pathways for increased economic development in Utah. To not conduct this monitoring would mean a loss of federal Title IIA funds, Pro Staff costs for qualified teachers, and likely drop in achievement for secondary students in ELA courses costing our economy.

- The estimated cost avoidance for this is the number of teachers currently on endorsement plans (30 teachers in secondary ELA, Speech, or Journalism) losing Pro Staff Costs **\$75,000** and 1500 ELA teachers in Utah not getting quality professional development (\$150 per teacher for one year=**\$225,000**). Total cost avoidance = approximately **\$300,000**.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

**COSTS:**

- \$182,043 = Cost for one FTE as ELA Secondary Specialist plus operating costs

**SYSTEM SAVINGS and AVOIDANCE COSTS:**

- \$10,800,000 = cost for one FTE per 41 districts and 85 charters
- \$300,000 = cost avoidance

**BENEFITS: \$10,917,957**

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Social Studies**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

Social studies is a core area in the education of all Utah children. The Teaching and Learning K-12 Social Studies Program reports to the State Director of Teaching and Learning. The K-12 Social Studies specialist provides technical support and leadership in the development and improvement of social studies education in the elementary and secondary schools of the state. The Social Studies Specialist plans, develops, promotes, implements and evaluates programs in social studies, including history, geography, economics, civics, psychology, sociology, and anthropology. The specialist provides and supports statewide training for school personnel of all levels, parents, other state agencies and the public. The specialist coordinates with colleges, universities and other educational institutions to improve the pre-service and in-service education of teachers, administrators and other school personnel. The specialist administers State and Federal grants, implementing and monitoring State and Federal legislation, and provides technical support in the area of current research-based practices.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code 53a-1-302. Implementation is governed by the following Board Rules: Board Rules on Core R277-700, R277-519; Board Rules on Licensing R277-500, R277-501, R277-502, R277-503, R277-510, R277-520; Utah Code on Licensing 53A-6; Board Rules on Instructional materials R277-269.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Social Studies implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Collect and report civic and character education data
- Develop, approve and implement social studies courses
- Facilitate the development and implementation of core standards
- Monitor school compliance
- Ensure that all educators teaching social studies are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Provide technical assistance to teachers, principals, professional development providers, universities and LEAs
- Act as a liaison with higher education institutions
- Ensure completion of performance plans and reports
- Provide general supervision of program compliance, and issue resolution
- Oversee professional development in Social Studies

- Manage communication and completion of assignments
- Coordination with other state agencies
- Administer state and federal grants as needed

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Pursuant to Utah code 53A-13-109, an annual report on civic and character methods and results to the Utah legislature is required. In addition the Teaching and Learning section provides information and other reports related to Social Studies upon request.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The section coordinates professional development initiatives, the crafting and revision of core standards, and the creation and dissemination of curricular materials and information.

Professional development for educators is provided to all LEAs using the best and most effective models in a continuous cycle of improvement and refinement.

Professional development and staff support for Utah social studies teachers is tailored to the variety of needs teachers have expressed. Professional development has included conferences, Saturday Seminars of content knowledge and pedagogical practices, specific endorsement courses offered in partnership with institutions of higher education, intensive curriculum development, core standards writing and revision, social studies master plan creation, leadership meetings and planning, and extensive partnerships with community organizations and civic groups devoted to providing support for teachers.

In 2011-2012, the USOE continued to provide traditional professional development for teachers across the state, but also embarked on a significant new endeavor, the creation of on-line endorsement courses designed for teachers who need to take additional college-level course work in order to advance in their positions and be highly-qualified educators. This program was created in response to a significant need for teachers from across the state to have access to these courses. The response has been enthusiastic, with immediate waiting lists in a number of the courses.

In addition, the specialist collaborated with colleagues across the state to implement the core academy professional development for 311 secondary social studies teachers, supported Saturday Seminars with 689 participants, and provided week-long professional development courses for 60 participants.

In 2012-2013 over 20 on-line courses were offered, many with waiting lists. Over 350 teachers were served with these courses, offering a significant service to them at minimal costs. The traditional collaborations with community agencies continued, with over 500 Saturday Seminar participants and week-long professional development courses for 85 participants.

The social studies specialist serves as a point of contact, committee member, or board member with the Judicial Outreach Subcommittee of the Utah State Courts, Law-Related Education, the Utah State Bar, the Lieutenant Governor’s Commission on Civic and Character Education, the Utah Geographic Alliance, the Utah Council for the Social Studies, Utah State History, Fort Douglas Museum, non-profit organizations such as Roots of Freedom and the Larry Miller Group’s Driven to Teach history seminar program, the Utah State History Fair, the United States Senate Youth program, the Granite School District Teaching American History Grant Board, the 3R’s Program/Face to Faith, the Gilder Lehrman United States History Teacher of the Year program and the Council of State Social Studies Specialists, as well as a point of contact for all social studies teachers in the state.

The specialist has instituted a list serve, web site, newsletter, and blog specifically targeted to social studies teachers. This newsletter is distributed electronically at least once per month, sometimes more frequently as conditions and events dictate. This newsletter is distributed to over 2500 subscribers, including all of the local district and charter social studies specialists, who then redistribute it to their teachers and patrons.

The specialist also serves as the liaison for international initiatives, and is responsible for the development of memoranda of understanding with partner nations. The specialist supports the placement of international teachers in key roles in dual immersion schools, handling the logistics for the interview process as well as the creation and maintenance of visa records.

In addition to maintaining a current web site and social studies newsletter, the specialist responds to phone and email inquiries on a daily basis from teachers and other patrons from across the state, assists with PRAXIS test review, and collaborates with institutions of higher education in their program review process.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Appropriation Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> <li>• Total Funding</li> </ul>	<p>\$79,403.47</p> <p>\$79,403.47</p>
--	--

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Facilities</li> <li>• Indirect cost</li> <li>• Other Current Costs</li> <li>• Total Costs</li> </ul>	<p>\$ 62,079.48</p> <p>\$ 4354.22</p> <p>\$ 3840.00</p> <p>\$ 8,149.77</p> <p>\$ 980.00</p> <p>\$ 79,403.47</p>
---	---

<b>Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:</b>	
<p>Because social studies is a core subject, taught by every teacher at the elementary level and at every grade at the secondary level, the social studies specialist has either direct or indirect contact with 24,078 elementary teachers, with 1,603 secondary social studies teachers. Contact and is also maintained with additional numbers of ELL, special education, inactive educators, home school teachers, and community members who partake in the professional development offered, access our web site, lesson plans and other internet resources, subscribe to our agency social studies newsletter and mailing list, or call or email with inquiries.</p> <p>Only four of the largest districts in Utah have a full-time or part-time social studies specialist. The remaining districts and all charters rely on the USOE to provide leadership, professional development, information, and general support of their educational efforts. Without this position, districts would have to provide this support themselves.</p>	
<b>Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:</b>	
<p>33 Utah LEAs receive significant cost savings from the work of the Teaching and Learning section and services associated with BTASLP, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance (\$10,000 per LEA), \$330,000</li> <li>• Planning and coordination of Social Studies programs (\$10,000 per LEA), \$330,000</li> <li>• Professional Development (\$10,000 per LEA) \$330,000</li> <li>• Oversight of the international guest teacher program (\$565,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Eight teachers from France and 25 from China are here because of this program. Their salaries are subsidized in excess of \$565,000 from their home nations.</li> <li>○ LEAs participating in the international guest teacher program save a total of \$565,000.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Total Cost Savings: \$1,555,000</p>	
<b>Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:</b>	
<p>LEAs are able to avoid individual program costs amounting to \$30,000 each or 132 times \$30,000 which equals \$3,900,000. The work of the section ensures integrity to the purpose and implementation of social studies at minimal financial cost.</p>	
<b>Source and Amount of Fund</b>	
State Education Funds	\$79,403.47
<b>Section Costs YTD</b>	
Personnel	62,079.48
Travel	4354.22

Facilities	3840.00
Current	980.00
Indirect Costs	8,149.77
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$79,403.47</b>
<b>Gross Benefit</b> (see above)	<b>\$5,455,000</b>
<b>Implications if Section were not to provide noted functions or programs:</b>	
Summary of Costs and Benefits:  This program saved LEAs the purchase of technical and curricular services costing approximately \$5,455,000 at current market rates.	
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$79,403.47</b>
<b>Gross Savings (Benefits plus Savings)</b>	<b>\$6,761,375</b>
<b>Net Savings (Gross Benefits minus Costs)</b>	<b>\$5,455,000</b>
<b>Benefits to Cost Ratio</b>	<b>67.69%</b>

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Special Education Services**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services section provides oversight of programs on behalf of the 70,500+ students with disabilities ages 3-21 in Utah to ensure that eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) and progress in the general education curriculum. This is accomplished through the implementation of the Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004.

This section also administers the Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship and the Paraeducator to Teacher Scholarship Program (PETTS). The Carson Smith Scholarship for Special Needs Students provides funding for eligible students at eligible private schools and serves approximately 750 students annually. The PETTS provides resources for qualified paraeducators to become licensed educators and from 2009 through 2011 resulted in 44 paraeducators working towards educator licensure.

All activities of this section are directly linked back to state and federal requirements, such as:

- 53A-15-301 through 53A-15-305 (Education of Children with Disabilities)
- 53A-15-1005 (Services to Students with Disabilities)
- 53A-24-114 (Governor's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities)
- 53A-25a-101 through 53A-25a-106 (USDB/Blind Persons' Literacy)
- 53A-25b-101 through 53A-25b-501 (USDB)
- 53A-26a-101 through 53A-26a-503 (Interpreter Services)
- 53A-17a-111 through 53A-17a-112 (Students with Disabilities)
- 53A-17a-158 (Stipends for Special Educators for additional days of work)
- 53A-1a-701 through 710 (Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship)
- 53A-6-802 (Paraeducator to Teacher Scholarship Program (PETTS))
- USBE Board Rule 277-602 Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship
- USBE Board Rule R277-438 Dual Enrollment
- USBE Board Rule R277-504 Licensure
- USBE Board Rule R277-525 Special Educator Stipends
- USBE Board Rule R277-750 Education Programs for Students with Disabilities
- USBE Board Rule R277-751 Special Education Extended School Year
- USBE Board Rule R277-800 USDB
- USBE Board Rule R277-526-1 Paraeducator to Teacher Scholarship Program (PETTS)
- State Board of Education Special Education Rules
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (34 CFR 300, 303)

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The IDEA and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rule implementation is accomplished through the following activities completed by the Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services section:

- Collecting and reporting state and federal data
- Writing and implementing policy and procedures to ensure compliance with IDEA and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules
- Monitoring of IDEA compliance in LEAs and state-funded private placements
- Ensuring that state assessments, alternate assessments, and accommodations are available

and appropriate for all students with disabilities

- Ensuring that all educators working with students with disabilities are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Disability specific activities (e.g., autism, intellectual disabilities, learning disabilities, sensory disabilities, etc.) to ensure that students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education
- Technical assistance to parents, advocates, and LEAs
- Completion of state performance plan (SPP) and annual performance report (APR) activities and reports
- General supervision of IDEA compliance, fiscal compliance, and dispute resolution
- Provide professional development to Utah general educators, special educators, paraeducators, related service providers, administrators, and parents regarding IDEA and specialized instruction
- Communication and completion of activities (required by federal and state statute to coordinate services) with other state-agencies such as DSPD, DSBVI, DSDHH, USOR, DOH, DCFS, USDB, JJS, and Dept. of Corrections
- Coordination with other USOE sections to ensure that students with disabilities are considered and included in policy decisions

The Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship and Paraeducator to Teacher Scholarship Program implementation is accomplished through the following activities completed by the Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services section:

- Accept and process applications for paraeducators, eligible students, and private schools
- Provide professional development for LEAs, private schools, and parents
- Monitor private schools and LEA notifications
- Process documentation of eligibility, application, and progress
- Calculate and distribute funding
- Monitor use of funds for compliance with State Law

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services section is responsible to complete the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR), which includes reporting on over 20 SPP/APR Indicators regarding:

- Graduation rates of students with disabilities
- Dropout rates of students with disabilities
- Assessment result and participation rates of students with disabilities
- Discipline data for students with disabilities
- Least restrictive environments for ages 3-5 and 6-21
- Preschool outcomes for students with disabilities ages 3-5
- Parent survey results
- Disproportionality (i.e., overrepresentation of students from specific subgroups (disability category, race/ethnicity within each LEA)
- IDEA compliance data
- Dispute resolution data for IEP facilitations, mediations, State complaints, and due process hearings

In addition, this section completes ongoing 618 data collections at the state level, which are also submitted federally. The IDEA, statute, and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rule

implementation is accomplished through the following state and federal reporting activities completed by the Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services section:

- Collecting and reporting state and federal data (i.e., child count, educational environments, personnel, exiting, discipline, dispute resolution, assessment, maintenance of effort, and coordinated early intervening services)
- Coordination of state data with EdFacts reporting system for accuracy
- Completion of state performance plan (SPP) and annual performance report (APR) activities and reports
- Creation of annual LEA reports based on APR data
- Completion of annual LEA determinations

The Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship and Paraeducator to Teacher Scholarship Program implementation is accomplished through the following activities completed by the Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services section:

- Annual reporting to the Utah State Board of Education and the Utah Legislature on the results of both activities

***Benefits Provided by the Program or Section:***

The work of the Utah State Office of Education Special Education section benefits not only students with disabilities in the state, but also students without disabilities and the public. Students with disabilities are provided with special education and related services that allow them to progress in the Utah Core Standards, graduate/complete school with academic and life skills, and work towards further education or careers. School staff is provided with professional development on high quality instruction and the use of data to inform instruction/select interventions that may be used with a wide population of students, thereby allowing more students to succeed in school and in later life. The public interacts with educated students who leave school with functional and academic skills, reducing the need for later reliance on state/federal programs or funds. For instance, some students who leave school without necessary skills and supports require ongoing support from taxpayers (e.g., cost of \$69,071 for residential supports per applicant, based on Utah Dept. of Human Services Annual Report, 2011).

A portion of federal IDEA funds are able to be used in LEAs to support early intervening programs to address the needs of at-risk student populations prior to a need for special education.

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

• State Education Funds (100 % distributed to LEAs)	\$ 255,269,000
• IDEA Federal Funds (94-96% distributed to LEAs)	\$ 112,944,952
• Other (Describe): (97% CSS distributed to families, 100% P2T distributed to LEAs)	\$ 3,750,000 (Carson Smith Scholarship Program) \$ 24,500 (Paraeducator to Teacher Scholarships)
Total Funding	<hr/> \$ 357,137,238

Section Costs: Costs detailed below include costs incurred at USOE for the administration of the section and statewide activities. The remaining funds (\$348,879,111) are distributed to LEAs for the implementation of services to students. All state special education funds are distributed to LEAs. Only a portion of IDEA and Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship funds are used for administration of the

programs.

• Personnel Costs	\$ 1,675,268
• Travel Expenses	\$ 59,335
• Current Expenses	\$ 1,235,047
• Other Charges	\$ 3,247,321
Total Costs	\$ 6,216,971

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

Failure of the USOE to fulfill the requirements of IDEA, 53A-15-301 through 305, and Utah State Board of Education Special Education Rules would render Utah ineligible for financial assistance under Part B of the IDEA and Section 619 of the IDEA, resulting in a loss of \$112,944,952 to Utah LEAs. This will have a direct and significant impact on the 70,500+ students with disabilities in the state by reducing LEA school and classroom staff, educational instruction and accommodations, and the availability of accessible assistive technology and materials. This reduction will in turn reduce educational performance of students with disabilities and high school graduation rates, with more students staying in the public school system through age 21 and will increase the costs of providing additional and ongoing post-school services to students who leave the public education system unskilled.

Failure to administer the Carson Smith Special Needs Scholarship and PETTS would result in the USOE being noncompliant with Utah Legislative direction, and would result in a loss of \$3,774,500 in state funding which goes directly to families of students with disabilities selecting a private school placement to meet their child's unique educational needs, which would impact over 750 students with special needs served in a parental choice private placement and a loss of up to 45 future trained educators annually. The USOE only retains 2.6% necessary to administer the program.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

Utah LEAs receive significant **system cost savings** from the implementation of USOE special education section functions in the areas of:

- Dispute Resolution activities between LEA and parents (\$500,000 legal costs)
- Technical Assistance (\$2,500,000)
- Professional Development (\$5,000,000)
- Fiscal Monitoring (\$200,000 if privately contracted)

These amounts are estimated based upon current costs and the current economy of scale.

Utah LEAs receive **significant program cost savings** from the implementation of USOE special education section functions in the areas of:

- APR (\$25,000)
- Monitoring (\$10,000 per LEA)
- Dispute Resolution (\$8,000 per LEA per occurrence)
- Technical Assistance (\$40,000 per LEA)
- Professional Development (\$50,000 per LEA)
- Fiscal Monitoring (\$10,000 per LEA)

These amounts are estimated based upon current costs and the current economy of scale.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

LEAs are able to **avoid program costs** as the result of implementation of section functions in the areas of:

- Returning funds for maintenance of effort (\$619,000 per LEA)

LEAs are able to **avoid system costs** as the result of the implantation of section functions in the areas of:

- Dispute resolution (\$2,800 per LEA)
- Additional costs related to correcting and repaying misuse of special education funds (\$3,000 per LEA)

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

- Compensatory Education (\$200,000)
- Legal action related to the denial of FAPE (\$600,000)
- Reimbursement for private school placement resulting from denial of FAPE (\$500,000)

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

The USOE received increased collections of \$112,944,952 from the US Department of Education for the implementation of section functions. LEAs receive increased collections of \$106,727,981 after the USOE Special Education Section administrative costs. The work of this section allows LEAs to focus on working with students with disabilities and meeting their needs, rather than using their finite resources for administrative responsibilities to the state and federal government. This has allowed the USOE to build an effective and proactive general supervisory system of monitoring and dispute resolution, resulting in few disputes and increased funding available for student services. The section is efficient and has ongoing contact with all LEAs, allowing for frequent and timely responses to LEA needs for technical assistance and professional development.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Early Childhood Program, Pre-kindergarten/Kindergarten, and the STAR Tutoring Program**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

**STAR Tutoring Program**

The purpose of Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (*STAR*) is to provide elementary grade students, who are reading a year to a year and a half below grade level, with additional reading practice. School, district, or state assessments are used to determine which students are reading below grade level and in need of additional reading tutoring. Trained adult tutors meet with students twice weekly for 30 minutes. Tutors support students as they practice reading from appropriately leveled texts and use skill lessons that enhance classroom instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary. Struggling readers benefit from increased reading time, targeted practice, and a rewarding reading experience.

Along with the STAR tutoring program, three other reading tutoring programs are currently available from USOE:

- The ***STAR Advanced*** tutoring program focuses on students reading below grade level 4-6 and older.
- The ***STAR Parent*** tutoring program provides a structure for parents to support struggling readers at home.
- The ***Cross-age*** tutoring program enables older students to tutor younger students.

**Early Childhood - Pre-Kindergarten/Kindergarten**

The purpose of the early childhood program is to provide materials and professional development for teachers and parents. These materials focus on academic and social emotional support for preschool/kindergarten children.

Utah State Code 53A-1-606.5 mandates reading remediation programs for students. The STAR Tutoring Program and the Early Childhood Program's implementation are governed by Board Rule R277-700-4 Elementary Education Requirements.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The STAR Tutoring Program's implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Provide professional development for districts and charter schools statewide in the four reading tutoring programs STAR K-3, STAR Advanced, STAR Parent, and Cross-age.
- Provide materials for schools (e.g., manuals, CD's, manipulative devices, website, etc. for use in the tutoring programs).
- Provide professional for development for AmeriCorps, who facilitate the tutoring programs in the schools.
- Provide professional development for the *Latino's in Action* program. High school and middle

school bilingual students are taught the *Cross-age Tutoring* program and become tutors to ELL elementary students.

- Provide parent training using the *STAR Parent* program in conjunction with the *KSL Read Today*, *KUED Ready to Learn* program, *Head Start*, and the *PTA*.
- Provide professional development for Southern Utah University education students who tutor children at elementary schools in Iron District.
- Provide professional development for the Principals Literacy Institute.
- Provide professional development for the *Foster Grandparents* program. Foster grandparents use the *STAR Tutoring* program in elementary schools statewide.
- Monitor use of funds
- Ensure supervision through site visits to all schools using the tutoring programs.

#### *Early Childhood Preschool/Kindergarten Program*

The Teaching and Learning section provides professional development and materials for Pre-kindergarten/Early Childhood programs (e.g., Early Childhood Standards, School Success booklets for four and five year olds, and Pre-Kindergarten pamphlets entitled “Kindergarten . . . Here We Come.” All materials are also provided in Spanish).

The Early Childhood Program’s implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning section:

- Provide professional development for Early Childhood Specialists in districts and charters regarding the implementation and usage of the Early Childhood Standards (approved by the Board in May 2012).
- Provide statewide professional development (Early Childhood Standards) at Early Childhood Leadership Conferences and district/school support throughout the year.
- Provide Pre-K pamphlets (Kindergarten . . . Here We Come!) for all students entering kindergarten. The pamphlets emphasize self-help skills, social/emotional skills, large motor skills, small motor skills, math skills, language/literacy skills, and Utah kindergarten entrance requirements.
- Provide professional development, and distribute *School Success Developmental* booklets for parents of four and five year olds (upon request). The booklets include activities dealing with listening, understanding print, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and mathematics.
- Monitor use of funds
- Serve on several advisory boards related to the field and make presentations to the following: Districts and Charter Schools, Universities, Salt Lake City Mayor’s Literacy Council, KSL Read Today, KUED Ready to Learn, Head Start, Early Childhood Systems Committee, and the Utah Department of Workforce Services Office of Work and Family Life.

#### ***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to provide reports and information upon request.

- STAR tutoring anecdotal records show the following:
  - Increased student academic achievement
  - Increased student engagement in learning

- Increased enthusiasm for reading
- Positive changes in students' behavior
- Increased participation in class activities
- Willingness to try new things
- Improved rates of student attendance
- Increases in student confidence and positive gains in social-emotional development

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

**STAR Reading Tutoring Program**

During the 2011-2012 school year between 12,000-15,000 students were provided with one-to-one adult volunteer reading tutoring. The majority of these students improved their oral reading fluency scores as exemplified by the DIBELS. In the 125 schools where AmeriCorps was in place using the STAR Reading Tutoring Program, approximately 79% of these students reached Benchmark on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS).

**Early Childhood Preschool/Kindergarten Program**

During the 2011-2012 school year approximately 50,000 English speaking children and 10,000 ELL preschool children were served and about 48,000 English speaking children and 8,000 ELL kindergarten children were served. Professional development and materials were provided for teachers in both preschool and kindergarten.

Additional observed benefits for students include:

- Increased student engagement
- Increased enthusiasm for reading
- Positive changes in students' behavior
- Increased participation in class activities
- Willingness to try new things
- Improved rates of student attendance
- Increases in student confidence and positive gains in social-emotional development
- Strengthening of the school community
- Increased teacher, parent, and community engagement
- Increased parent attendance at parent/teacher conferences
- Improved teacher collaboration and morale

***Source and Amount of program-specific Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

● State Education Funds	\$48,000.00 (STAR Reading Tutoring) \$10,000.00 (Preschool/Kindergarten)
● Federal Funds	\$No Federal Funds
● Other (Describe):	\$No Other Funds
● Total Funding	\$58,000.00

**Program Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 115,568.18
• Travel Expenses	1,403.39
• Current Expenses	-
• Other Charges	21,548.73
• Total Costs	<u>\$ 138,520.30</u>

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

**STAR Reading Tutoring Program (R277-700-4)**

During the 2011-2012 school year between 12,000-15,000 students were provided with one-to-one adult volunteer reading tutoring. The majority of these students improved their oral reading fluency scores as exemplified by the DIBELS. In the 125 schools where AmeriCorps was in place using the STAR Reading Tutoring Program, approximately 79% of these students reach Benchmark.

**Early Childhood Preschool/Kindergarten Program (R277-700-4)**

During the 2011-2012 school year approximately 50,000 English speaking children and 10,000 ELL preschool children were served and about 48,000 English speaking children and 8,000 ELL kindergarten children were served. Professional development and materials were provided for teachers in both preschool and kindergarten.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

**STAR Reading Tutoring Program**

If the volunteers serving as STAR reading tutors from businesses, the LDS Church, the Catholic Church, United Way, Prosperity 2020, Grandparents Associations, Latinos in Action, and High School organizations were to be replaced by paid paraprofessionals at a Level II rate of \$12.00 per hour the results financially disastrous. Approximately 300+ elementary schools are using the program. Most schools have about 20 volunteer tutors who work with children approximately two hours weekly.

Approx. number of volunteers per school	20 (some have as many as 50+)
Two hours per volunteer per week	40 hours per week per school
Approx. number of schools using STAR	300
Approx. number of volunteers in STAR	6000
Level II paraprofessional salary	\$12.00/hour
Approx. funding if using paid paraprofessionals working two hours per week = \$24.00	\$144,000.00
Approx. 300 people to coordinate program	\$30,000.00
Materials	\$25,000.00
Professional Development	<u>\$10,000.00</u>
Total Cost Avoidance	\$209,000.00

**Early Childhood Preschool/Kindergarten Program**

• Professional Development	\$ 10,000.00
• Materials	<u>\$ 10,000.00</u>
• Total Benefit	\$ 20,000.00

<b>Source and Amount of Funds</b>	
State Education Funds	58,000
<b>Section Costs YTD</b>	
Personnel Costs	115,568.18
Travel Expenses	1,403.39
Current Expenses	-
Other Charges	21,548.73
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>138,520</b>
<b>Gross Benefit (see above)</b>	<b>229,000</b>
<b>Implications if Section were not to provide noted functions or programs:</b>	
Summary of Costs and Benefits:	
<p>The Teaching and Learning section provides professional development and materials; trains adult volunteer reading tutors serving 15,000 children; delivers professional development and materials to teachers affecting another 50,000 students requiring ELL services. Total benefit is valued conservatively in terms of market costs of replacing these services, without an attempt to value resulting benefit to students. Direct cost avoidance is \$229,000.</p>	
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>138,520</b>
<b>Net Savings (Gross Benefits minus Costs)</b>	<b>90,480</b>
<b>Benefits to Cost Ratio</b>	<b>1.26</b>

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

Total State Expenditures:	\$ 138,520
Estimated Alternative Service Costs:	\$ 209,000 (STAR)
	\$ 20,000 (Early Childhood)
Total Costs	\$ 229,000
Net Benefit of Position to State:	\$ 90480

**Overall benefits related to program implementation:**

- Positive changes in achievement
- Positive changes in school climate and culture
- Improvement in teacher morale
- Feelings of school community within the building
- Community and parent involvement and engagement in the school
- Tutors contribute to mentoring and promoting high expectations for students.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: State Substance Abuse Prevention**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

**53A-13-102.** Instruction on the harmful effects of alcohol, tobacco, and controlled substances  
Rulemaking authority -- Assistance from the Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health.

**51-9-405.** (c) The State Office of Education shall use the allocation in public school programs for:

- (i) substance abuse prevention and education;
- (ii) substance abuse prevention training for teachers and administrators; and
- (iii) district and school programs to supplement, not supplant, existing local prevention efforts in cooperation with local substance abuse authorities.

**NCLB Title IV Part A SEC. 4112.** “(3) Uniform Management Information and Reporting System.

“(A) INFORMATION AND STATISTICS.—A State shall establish a uniform management information and reporting system.

**DHS / DSAMH Agreement # 2010-07-1** (3) Provide science based evaluation of Prevention Dimensions or contract this service to a qualified entity to do so.

Utah’s Substance Abuse Prevention Program “Prevention Dimensions”:

- Developed in 1982-83 as a joint effort between the Utah State Office of Education, Utah State Division of Substance Abuse, Mental Health, Utah Department of Health and Utah PTA.
- Conducts teacher in-service sessions throughout the school year to train teachers, counselors, administrators and other school personnel in prevention science and research and the delivery of school-based curriculum.
- Makes available age appropriate Prevention Dimensions materials for classroom use focused on student social competence skills to enhance academic skills
- Assists students and families in preventing the engagement-in substance abuse and other negative behaviors.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- a. Provide leadership to Local Education Authority (LEA) and Charter Schools in regards to Substance Abuse Prevention.
- b. Assure that State Substance Abuse Prevention dollars are dispersed equitably through a RFP process.
- c. Review Districts/Charter Schools plans to ensure compliance with funding requirements and adherence to Utah’s Prevention Guiding Principles.
- d. Assure that State Substance Abuse Prevention funding is used to adequately train teachers in effective prevention strategies and the importance of integrating evidence-based prevention in the classroom.
- e. Contract with Social Research Institute (SRI) at University of Utah to evaluate the effectiveness of the prevention effort.
- f. Develop and disseminate K-12 classroom substance abuse prevention resource materials.
- g. Conduct teacher trainings which increase the knowledge levels of K-12 teachers to:
  - Understand the teacher’s role in prevention
  - Use daily classroom prevention strategies
  - Increase student social learning objectives
  - Increase academic outcomes.
- h. Provide technical assistance.
- i. Monitor fiscal and programmatic implementation of prevention efforts and complete state and federal

reports such as Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and State's Annual Superintendent Report.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

1. State—Annual Superintendents Report Incidence of Delinquent Activities
2. Federal—Consolidated Performance State Report of Program Effectiveness
3. Contract report from University of Utah Social Research Institute Report of Prevention Dimensions Program Effectiveness

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

By providing Substance Abuse Prevention Services the following benefits are recognized:

- Teachers receive researched based, grade appropriate curriculum materials for teaching students to make healthy decisions regarding the harms of alcohol, tobacco and other drug use.
- Curriculum helps reduce risk factors in the lives of students which place them at higher risk of engaging in substance abuse behaviors.
- Increases protective factors which equip students with necessary life skills to navigate the obstacles of life in a positive pro-social way.
- Reduces the number of youth involved in substance abuse;<sup>1</sup>
- Collaboration between Utah State Office of Education, Utah State Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health and Utah Department of Health utilizes limited prevention resources to provide statewide comprehensive prevention services.
- Data generated from the biennial Utah Student Health and Risk Prevention (SHARP) Survey shows positive decreases in the number and percentage of students who are using alcohol (lifetime and past-month use), students who are using prescription narcotics (lifetime and past-month use), and students who are at-risk in the school domain.
  - a. SHARP data shows a steady decrease in student alcohol use and an increase in parent/student disapproval of underage drinking.
    - i. SHARP data indicate that in 2007, 26.9% of Utah 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students used alcohol in their lifetime. By 2011, that percentage had decreased to 22.8%; and in 2013, the percentage decreased even further to 20.8%. When looking at lifetime alcohol use for individual grades, use rates for Utah youth in 2013 were half of those of youth at the national level (according to national Monitoring the Future data). The fact that Utah continues to decrease its alcohol use rates year after year is a strong testimony to the powerful prevention work being done in the State of Utah.
    - ii. In 2007, 11.3% of 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students used alcohol in the past month. In 2009, the percentage had decreased to 9.3%; in 2011, the percentage decreased to 8.6%; and in the most recent SHARP Survey administration, the data show that the rate of 30-day alcohol use decreased even further to 7.0%. 2013 SHARP and Monitoring the Future data show that Utah youth in all grades have 30-day alcohol use rates that are one-third of those at a national level. For example, 14.0% of Utah 12<sup>th</sup> graders indicated that they had used alcohol in the past month, whereas 41.5% of 12<sup>th</sup> graders in the national sample indicated past month use.
    - iii. In 2007, 6.9% of students indicated they had binge drank in the past two weeks. The 2013 SHARP data show that this percentage decreased to 4.9%.
    - iv. SHARP data also show that more parents are communicating to youth that underage drinking is very wrong. When asked, "How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to drink alcohol?" 84.8% of students in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade indicated "very wrong". This was an increase of 11.1% from 2011 when 73.7%

indicated it was “very wrong”.

- v. In 2007, 87.2% of students indicated that they felt it was “Wrong” or “Very Wrong” for someone their age to drink alcohol. The 2013 SHARP data show that this percentage has increased to 91.1%.
- b. How do these percentages translate to actual 6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade youth in the state of Utah? SHARP data indicate that in 2011, 22.8% of students used alcohol in their lifetime, 8.6% used alcohol in the past month, and 6.6% reported binge drinking in the past two weeks. If these same rates had continued through 2013, we would have had 72,558 students who had used alcohol in their lifetime, 27,368 who used alcohol in the past month, and 21,004 who binge drank in the past two weeks. However, in 2013, SHARP data indicate that we had 63,646 students indicating lifetime alcohol use (20.8%), 22,277 who drank alcohol in the past month (7.0%), and 15,594 who binge drank in the past two weeks (4.9%). **This means that, just through two years of prevention work, in 2013 we had 8,911 fewer students trying alcohol, 5,092 fewer students regularly using alcohol, and 5,410 fewer students binge drinking due to our prevention efforts.**
- c. Utah’s prevention system has also made tremendous impacts on youth prescription narcotics use. In 2007, 9.5% of 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students indicated using prescription narcotics at least once in their lifetime and 3.4% indicating using prescription narcotics in the past month. In 2013, the data show that lifetime prescription use had dropped to a mere 1.5%. Past month use had decreased to 0.7% in 2013.
- d. Many studies have shown that there is a strong link between prevention work and academic performance. The SHARP data also show that significant positive impacts have also been made in decreasing the percent of Utah youth who are at risk for engaging in problem behaviors to due to Academic Failure and a Low Commitment to school. In 2007, 33.8% of students were at-risk for the Academic Failure risk factor scale; the 2013 SHARP data show this percentage has decreased to 30.5%. In 2007, 38.2% of students were at-risk for the Low Commitment to School risk factor scale; the 2013 SHARP data show this percentage has decreased to 36.9%.
- e. During these same years (2007-2013) USOE trained an average of over 1000 teachers per year in Prevention Dimensions. Data related to the trainings shows that **teachers reported teaching an average of 3.5 PD lessons a month.**
- f. In addition, the comprehensive nature of Utah prevention efforts are reflected in the annual Tobacco Prevention and Control in Utah report which says that teen smoking rates in Utah (5.9%) are the lowest in the nation.

<sup>(1)</sup> **2013 SHARP Prevention Needs Assessment—Bach-Harrison, LCC**

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe): Contract with Utah State Division of Substance Abuse/Mental Health.</li> </ul>	<p>\$ 456,735</p> <p>\$ NA</p> <p>\$ 153,312</p> <hr/> <p>\$ 610,047</p>
<b>Total Funding</b>	

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Evaluation</li> <li>• Current Expenses (Teacher Trainings, Printing, Teacher Resource Materials)</li> <li>• Other Charges—Indirect Cost</li> </ul>	<p>\$ 47,433.57</p> <p>\$ 5,811.91</p> <p>\$ 53,240.00</p> <p>\$ 91,984.10</p> <hr/> <p>\$ 1,703.49</p>
---	---

Total Costs	\$ 200,173.07
-------------	---------------

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

1. Higher cost for prevention programs in districts.
2. Teachers would not receive prevention training nor adequate substance abuse prevention resources to utilize in the classroom
3. Principals and teachers would be less likely to implement effective prevention strategies.
4. Less school implementation and less comprehensive prevention efforts in community. School system takes “backseat role/responsibilities” in community-wide prevention efforts.
5. No monitoring to assure limited prevention dollars are used effectively.
6. Less collaboration among state agencies resulting in reduction in effective prevention programming. This would also lead to:
  - Fewer resources for student social skills learning
  - Higher teen alcohol use rates
  - Higher teen tobacco use rates
  - Continual increase in amount of bullying incidents

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

1. Schools would be expected to look for research-based prevention program.
2. Commercially produced programs contain the same prevention strategies as Prevention Dimensions but are more expensive for schools to purchase.
3. There is more efficient use of teacher/student interaction time because materials and trainings are readily available.
4. The USOE provides research based instructional materials that reduces teacher preparation time allowing increased time for instructional delivery.
5. The delivery of standardized training and curriculum that is consistent from one district/charter to the next

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

1. The state would be less likely to show a decrease in substance use and its related costly behaviors
2. There will be an increase in medical cost, health cost, social service cost, law enforcement incarceration costs, and a loss of productivity.
3. Not in compliance with state statute

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

1. Individual LEAs would have to utilize precious dollars, time and effort to determine which research-based program to utilize.
2. Commercially produced programs are much more expensive.
3. There are no alternative state programs; as such without Prevention Dimensions,
  - effective prevention strategies would less likely be implemented (Such was the case with the loss

of Federal Safe and Drug-Free Schools funding.)

- lack of implementation of effective school based prevention would lead to increase in substance use and increase in other negative behaviors.
- there would be a negative impact with costs of medical services, healthcare, social services, law enforcement and incarceration.
- there would be less student productivity and,
- there would be lower academic achievement.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

1. According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), every \$1 invested in substance abuse prevention in the state of Utah can result in a \$36 savings in health care costs, law enforcement, other state-funded social and welfare services, and increased productivity. (1 The Substance Abuse Prevention Dollars and Cents: A Cost Benefit Analysis, <http://www.samhsa.gov>.)
2. The report also shows, “These cost-benefit estimates show that effective school-based programs could save \$18 for every \$1 spent on these programs.”  
Applying the above report to the Utah State Substance Abuse Prevention Budget of \$610,000 means an estimated cost savings of health care, laws enforcement and social services of \$10,980,000.
3. The limited State Substance Abuse Prevention dollars which are received and administered at the Utah State Office of Education (\$610,000) produce many solid prevention benefits among which are:
  - coordination and collaboration among various state agencies and entities.
  - coordination of statewide substance abuse prevention curriculum and strategies.
  - positive trends in reduction of substance abuse and other negative behaviors.
  - positive trends in an increase of protective factors.
  - reduction in negative societal costs.

Benefit-Cost: 55

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Office of the Superintendent**

**Program: Administration of K-12 Public Education Statewide**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory Provisions fulfilled:***

- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 3 – In carrying out its mandate of general control and supervision of the public education system, the State Board of Education is required to appoint a State Superintendent of Public Instruction (“Superintendent”) to serve as the executive officer of the Board.
- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 1 - Requires the Superintendent to maintain a public education system, which shall be open to all children of the state and is free, and non-sectarian.
- Utah Constitution Article X, Section 5 - Establishes a permanent State School Fund for the support of the public elementary and secondary schools with interest and dividends received from investment of the State School Fund may be expended for the support of the public education system as defined in Article X, Section 2 of this constitution, under direction of the Superintendent.
- JR4-2-403 – Provides requested factual input and analysis to Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst as it reviews legislation to determine its fiscal impact.
- 20 U.S.C. §1232h; 20 U.S.C. §1232g; 34 CFR Part 99
- 29 U.S.C. § 793 and 41 CFR Part 60-741 Sec. 17
- Public Law 108-446
- PUBLIC LAW 107–110, “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001” Titles I through IX.
- Title 53A including:
  - 53A-1-303 -The state superintendent must advise superintendents, school boards, and other school officers upon all matters involving the welfare of the schools and, upon district request, provide written opinions on questions of public education, administrative policy, and procedure.
  - 53A-1-301 – The Superintendent is required to administer all programs assigned to the State Board of Education in accordance with the policies and the standards established by the Board, and shall perform duties assigned by the Board, including the following:
    - Investigating all matters pertaining to the public schools.
      - Adopting and keeping an official seal to authenticate the Superintendent’s official acts.
      - Holding and conducting meetings, seminars, and conferences on educational topics.
      - Collecting and organizing educational data into an automated decision support system to facilitate school district and school improvement planning, accountability reporting, performance recognition, and the evaluation of educational policy and program.
      - Developing and implementing an educational strategy of focusing on core academics.
      - Developing and implementing of competency-based education and progress-based assessments with results measured by individual progress-based assessments and a comparison of Utah students' progress with the progress of students in other states using standardized norm-referenced tests as benchmarks.
      - Collecting and disseminating statistical and financial information about the school system which the Superintendent considers pertinent.
      - Developing data elements required under applicable state or federal law or state board

- rule.
- Establishing procedures for the collection and management of education data including protecting the confidentiality of data under state and federal privacy laws, and requiring all school districts and schools to comply with the data collection and management procedures.
- Administering federal educational programs.
- Preparing and submitting to the governor a budget for the board to be included in the budget that the governor submits to the Legislature.
- Distributing funds deposited in the Autism Awareness Restricted Account.
- Calculating a pupil-teacher ratio for a school, a median pupil-teacher ratio of the schools within a school district, a median pupil-teacher ratio of charter schools in the state, and a median pupil-teacher ratio of public schools in the state.
- Maintaining an Internet website where pupil-teacher ratios for each school and other information may be accessed.
- 53A-1-402 – The State Board of Education must establish minimum standards for public schools.
- 53A-1-603 – As Executive Officer of the State Board of Education the Superintendent is required to:
  - Direct each school district and charter school to implement the Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) including statewide criterion-referenced tests or online computer adaptive tests in grades 3 through 12 and courses in basic skill areas of the core curriculum, an online writing assessment to all students in grades 5 and 8, a tenth grade basic skills competency test, and a test to all students in grade 3 to measure reading grade level.
  - Submit and recommend criterion-referenced achievement tests or online computer adaptive tests, a tenth grade basic skills competency test, an online writing assessment for grades 5 and 8, and a test for students in grade 3 to measure reading grade level to the board for approval and adoption and distribution to each school district and charter school.
  - Develop an assessment method to uniformly measure statewide performance, school district performance, and school performance of students in grades 3 through 12 in mastering basic skills courses; provide for the state to participate in the National Assessment of Educational Progress state-by-state comparison testing program.
  - Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, annually require each school district and charter school to administer a computer adaptive assessment system adopted by the State Board of Education and aligned to Utah's common core.
  - Develop adopt rules for the conduct and administration of U-PASS to include:
  - Computation of student performance based on information disaggregated with respect to race, ethnicity, gender, limited English proficiency, and free or reduced price school lunch.
  - Security features.
  - Exemption of student test scores by exemption category (including Limited English Proficiency, mobility, and Disability status), with the percent or number of student test scores exempted being publically reported at a district level.
  - Compilation of criterion-referenced, online computer adaptive, and online writing test scores and test score averages at the classroom level to allow for annual review of those scores by parents of students and professional and other appropriate staff at the classroom level.

- Establish rules for application, award and administrative oversight of money for computer adaptive tests.
- Assuring that computer adaptive tests are administered in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 13, Part 3, Utah Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.
- Establishing a committee to review all computer adaptive test questions and provide staff support to committee.
- Requiring each licensed employee to complete two hours of professional development on youth suicide prevention within their license area.
- Developing sample materials to be used by a school district or charter school for professional development training on youth suicide prevention.
- 53A-1a-107 – To ensure all students have the ability to learn and that each student departing the system will be prepared to achieve success in productive employment, further education, or both, the State Board of Education/Superintendent must provide:
  - Model curriculum
  - Framework for an education system, including core competencies and their assessment permitting students to advance by demonstrating competency in subject matter and mastery of skills.
  - Educational performance indicators describing trends in student performance.
  - Teacher professional development opportunities and evaluation programs.
  - Mechanism for widespread dissemination of information about strategic planning for public education, including involvement of business and industry.
  - Research and development clearing house at the state level.
  - In concert with the State Board of Regents and the state's colleges of education, review and revise teacher licensing requirements.
- 53A-1 - Administration of Public Education at the State Level Administration of Public Education at the State Level.
- 53A-1a- 110 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent must contract with a provider to provide computer software programs and activity manuals for students with autism and other special needs in pre-school through grade 2.
- 53A-6 -104 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent may issue licenses for educators and establish the criteria for obtaining and retaining licenses.
- 53A-8a-302; 53A-8a-409 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent must provide guidelines, requirements, and procedures for the development and implementation of employee evaluations; require school districts to choose valid and reliable methods and tools to implement the evaluations; establish a timeline for school districts to implement employee evaluations; report to the Education Interim Committee, as requested, on progress.
- 53A-11 – 1305 The State Board of Education/Superintendent must adopt rules to implement ensure protection of individual rights of Students in Public Schools.
- 53A-11a – 302 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent must develop a model policy on bullying, cyber-bullying, harassment, hazing, and retaliation and post the model policy on the State Board of Education's website.
- 53A-12 –101 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent must ensure that public schools are free to all children between five and 18 years of age who are residents of the district, and also to persons over 18 who are domiciled in the state of Utah and have not completed high school.
- 53A-13 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent oversees Curriculum in the Public

Schools.

- 53A-14-101; 53A-14-105 – The State Board of Education/Superintendent must appoint a State Instructional Materials Commission to evaluate instructional materials for recommendation by the board, and may award contracts for furnishing instructional materials.
- 53A-15 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent administers standards and programs including Concurrent Enrollment, Early Graduation, Critical Languages and Dual Immersion, Special Education, Gang Prevention, Electronic High School, the Statewide Online Education Program.
- 53A-17a - The State Board of Education/Superintendent administers funding appropriated under the Minimum School Program Act, and provides yearly estimates of funding requirements in concert with GOPB and LFA.
- 53A-19 – The State Superintendent of Public Instruction ensures compliance with School District Budgetary law including those governing National School Lunch Program revenues.
- 53A-20-106 - The State Superintendent of Public Instruction ensures compliance with School Construction life/safety requirements existing in both state and federal code, and develops and implements plans relating to the building of educational buildings for the use and benefit of school districts and educational institutions and agencies of the state. It may enter into agreements on behalf of the state, its school districts, and its educational agencies and institutions with the federal government and its agencies, and with the school districts, educational agencies, and institutions of the state, as necessary to comply with federal legislation and to secure for them rights of participation as necessary to fulfill the educational building needs of the state. It may also accept, allocate, disburse, and otherwise deal with federal funds or other assets.
- 53A-20b-103 –The state superintendent of public instruction serves on the governing board of the Utah Charter School Finance Authority and provides staff support to the authority for purposes of facilitating Charter School participation in a Credit enhancement program allowing issuance of bonds to finance capital projects and equipment by qualifying charter schools.
- 53A-21-202 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent determines the foundation guarantee level per ADM that fully allocates the funds appropriated to the State Board of Education for school district capital outlay and debt service purposes under the Public Education Capital Outlay Act.
- 53A-22-106 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent determines standards and rules necessary for the administration and enforcement of statutes governing construction of schools.
- 53A-23 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent ensures compliance with requirements of this chapter, which enables local school board to establish and maintain a reserve fund to meet capital outlay costs.
- 53A-24-103 – The State Office of Rehabilitation Utah State Office of Rehabilitation serves under the policy direction of the State Board of Education and under the direction and general supervision of the superintendent of public instruction.
- 53A-25a -Blind Persons' Literacy Rights and Education Act Blind Persons' Literacy Rights and Education Act.
- 53A-25b-106 - The State Board of Education/Superintendent must adopt procedures to assess the competencies referred to under "Blind Persons' Literacy Rights and Education Act," consistent with standards adopted by the National Library Service for the Blind and

Physically Handicapped; require teachers of the blind to meet the standards adopted by the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. The State Board of Education is the governing board of the Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind, which is overseen by the Superintendent.

- 53A-26a -201 – The Superintendent oversees a Board-appointed designee assisting the State Board of Education and the Interpreters Certification Board, and makes all appointments to the Interpreter Certification Board.53A-29 -202 – In determining eligibility for the “Utah School Bond Guaranty Act Utah School Bond Guaranty Act,” State Treasurer and the Superintendent each certify in writing that the board is fiscally solvent.

***State/Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by Section:***

- Federal Laws having applicability to either K-12 students, or the adults which work in K-12 education, require administration and oversight by that entity in charge of public education at the state level. These responsibilities reside with the Utah State Board of Education and its Executive Officer, the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Responsibilities include, in part, application of:
  - Title 34 U.S.C. “Education,” and Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).
  - PUBLIC LAW 107–110, “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001” Titles I through IX.
  - Public Law 108-446,” Individuals with Disabilities Education Act” (IDEA) - Title II covers all activities of State and local governments regardless of the government entity's size or receipt of Federal funding. Title II requires that state and local governments give people with disabilities an equal opportunity to benefit from all of their programs, services, and activities including public education.
  - 29 U.S.C. § 793 and 41 CFR Part 60-741 Sec. 17, “The Rehabilitation Act of 1998”and implementing legislation - Application of any State rule or policy relating to the administration or operation of programs (including any rule or policy based on State interpretation of any Federal law, regulation, or guideline) funded by this Act. These are required to be identified as a State-imposed requirement and, in the area of Public Education, are administered by the Superintendent.
- 20 U.S.C. §1232h; 20 U.S.C. §1232g; 34 CFR Part 99 - Protecting privacy of student education records and specifically individually identifiable information.
- UCA Title 53A, State System of Public Education” - Executive responsibility for all Sections, Utah State Office of Education, and Minimum School Program Funding.

***State/Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by State Board of Education Executive Officers (exclusive of sectional reporting):***

- **State**

The Superintendent must present the Governor and the Legislature annually a report of the public school system for the preceding year to include:

  - Statement of fund balances.
  - Data on the general condition of the schools with recommendations considered desirable for specific programs.

- Statement of revenues by fund and source.
- Statement of adjusted expenditures by fund.
- Status of bonded indebtedness, the cost of new school plants, and school levies.
- Statement of state funds allocated to each school district and charter school by source, including supplemental appropriations.
- Statement of expenditures by each school district and charter school, including supplemental appropriations, by function and object as outlined in the U.S. Department of Education publication "Financial Accounting for Local and State School Systems".
- Statement, by school district and charter school, of the amount of and percentage increase or decrease in expenditures from the previous year attributed to: wage increases, with expenditure data for base salary adjustments identified separately from step and lane expenditures, medical and dental premium cost adjustments, and adjustments in the number of teachers and other staff.
- Data on fall enrollments, average membership, high school graduates, licensed and classified employees including data reported by school districts on educator ratings, pupil-teacher ratios, average class sizes, average salaries.
- Private school data.
- Data from standardized norm-referenced tests in grades 5, 8, and 11 on each school and district.
- Statistical information regarding incidents of delinquent activity in the schools or at school-related activities with separate categories for alcohol and drug abuse, weapon possession, assaults and arson.

- **Federal**

- NCES - Statement of expenditures by each school district and charter school, including supplemental appropriations, by function and object as outlined in the U.S. Department of Education publication "Financial Accounting for Local and State School Systems."
- NAEP - Federal and State National Assessment of Educational Progress - reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act legislation requires states who receive Title I funding to participate in state NAEP in reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 every two years (53A-1-603 also).
- Common Core of Data (CCD) submissions - As a program of the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, this requires annual collection of fiscal and non-fiscal data about all public schools, public school districts and state education agencies in the United States. Information describes schools and school districts including descriptive information about students and staff, including demographics, and fiscal data.
- All other data submissions required under ESEA, IDEA, Office of Civil Rights from State Educational Authorities.

***Benefits Provided by Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:***

Value of Services provided through executive function of the Superintendency as executive officers, and the State Superintendent K-12 Public Education Programs, Minimum School Program Funding Programs, plus certain Adult Education Programs:

Increase in life-time earnings attributed to K-12 education versus lack thereof, using U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Utah State Office of Education 2010-11 Data (most recent year currently

available). This estimation does not take into account the nature of the education, nor any unmonetized benefits accruing to the society or the individual.

Weekly Earnings of High School Graduate (BLS, 2011)	Weeks per year	Yearly earnings, high school graduate	Years, post-high-school to retirement age	Life-time Minimum Earnings	Number of Utah Children Educated, 2011	Minimum Lifetime value of Educational Services Rendered to Utah children assuming all graduate with a high school degree, and none pursue any variety of higher education or vocational or technical training
\$ 638	52	\$ 33,176	43	\$ 1,426,568	587,745	\$ 838,458,209,160
Weekly Earnings of Non-High-School-Graduate (BLS, 2011)	Weeks per year	Yearly earnings, high school graduate	Years, post-high-school to retirement age	Life-time Minimum Earnings	Number of Utah Children Educated, 2011	Minimum Lifetime value of Educational Services Rendered to Utah children assuming all graduate with a high school degree, and none pursue any variety of higher education or vocational or technical training
\$ 451	52	\$ 23,452	43	\$ 1,008,436	587,745	\$ 592,703,216,820
Net Benefit of Education (increase in life-time earnings, whole K-12 population)						\$ 245,754,992,340
Dollar Benefit Per Year of Education (divided by 13 representing K-12)						\$ 18,904,230,180

#### Alternative Cost

- Alternative Cost may be valued as Savings equal to the Cost of Private Schooling: \$2,656,589,768 to \$9,259,470,363 per year. In 2007, the Sutherland Institute estimated the average cost of Private schooling in Utah to be \$4,519.97. Ignoring inflation, if Utah's existing K-12 public school population were educated at this cost for 13 years, the cost would be \$58,760 per child, or \$34,535,666,980 in total, or \$2,656,589,768 per year in total.
- If an equivalent number of children were educated in our most expensive Private School (Rowland Hall), the cost would rise to \$120,373,114,725 at \$204,805 per student, or \$9,259,470,363 per year.

**Implications if State-level Administration provided by the Office of the Superintendent failed to provide noted functions or programs:**

- Decrease in protections afforded students, without mandatory minimums established by state-level regulatory body. The result would be an increase in criminal and civil lawsuits levied against LEAs.
- Without guaranteed minimum equitable standard of per pupil funding distribution statewide, civil lawsuits levied against LEAs and state authorities would proliferate.
- Without guaranteed minimum equitable standard of per pupil funding distribution statewide, civil lawsuits levied against LEAs and state authorities would proliferate.
- Without guaranteed minimum special education and accommodative services offered statewide, civil lawsuits levied against LEAs and state authorities would proliferate.
- The state of Utah would be unable to defend itself in lawsuits alleging insufficient services to students if no statewide standard were set, given lack of existence of superintending authority. Liability of individual LEAs would increase concomitantly.
- Without guaranteed minimum employment standards and protections of civil rights levied across the whole system of public education statewide, civil lawsuits levied against LEAs and state authorities would proliferate.
- Increase in lawsuits related to federal compliance issues.
- Increase in lawsuits related to LEA compliance with state law.
- Decrease in Financial Capacity of LEAs to administer education without support and training from Utah State Office of Education (as detailed in section summaries).
- Increase in Costs to LEAs as these seek private resources to replicate areas of technical assistance and data gathering and production currently overseen by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (as detailed in section summaries).
- Loss of uniformity of standards, procedures and data collection developed and administered through the application of Utah State Board of Education Board Administrative Rule (as detailed in section summaries).
- Loss of all Federal Programmatic Funding including funding for Special Education Compliance, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Compliance, Civil Rights Compliance, Americans with Disability Act compliance. Loss of Impact Aid, McKinney Vento Program Funding, Title I Funding, Pre-School Funding and more varieties. In fiscal year 2013, \$339,867,100 in federal funds to flow through USOE. Such funding assumes oversight by an SEA for which the Superintendent serves as chief officer (as detailed in section summaries).

<b>State Office of Education</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Education Fund	\$ 29,216,800
Education Fund, One time	1,620,000
Uniform School Fund	-
General Fund	-
General Fund - one time	100,000
Federal Funds	340,263,900
Dedicated Credits Revenue	5,868,200
General Fund Restricted - Mineral Lease	3,095,000
USF Restricted - Land Exchange Distribution Account	236,600

Uniform School Fund Restricted - Interest and Dividends Account	536,000
General Fund Restricted - Substance Abuse Prevention	499,400
Restricted Revenue	-
Other Financing Sources	-
Revenue Transfers - Interagency	688,800
Revenue Transfers - State Office of Education	-
Beginning Nonlapsing Appropriations Balances	10,508,100
Closing Nonlapsing Appropriations Balances	(10,508,100)
From Lapsing Balance	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 382,125,500</b>
<b>Schedule of Programs</b>	
Board of Education	-
Student Achievement	-
Data and Business Services	-
Law, Legislation and Education Services	-
Assessment and Accountability	19,290,900
Board and Administration	5,566,000
Business Services	2,063,000
Career and Technical Education	17,112,900
District Computer Services	7,032,400
Educational Equity	378,100
Educational Technology	1,430,100
Federal ESEA	138,368,200
Law and Legislation	283,200
Public Relations	182,200
School Trust	546,700
Special Education	157,293,700
Teaching and Learning	32,078,100
Math Teacher Training	500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 382,125,500</b>

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

Estimated Benefit of Programs and Initiatives  
overseen by Office of the Superintendent: \$ 9,259,470,363

BENEFIT: Cost of Private Schooling through Private (versus Public) administration of K-12 education.

In 2007, the Sutherland Institute estimated the average cost of Private schooling in Utah to be \$4,519.97. Ignoring inflation, if Utah's existing K-12 public school population were educated at this cost for 13 years, the cost would be \$58,760 per child, or \$34,535,666,980 in total, or \$2,656,589,768 per year in total across 13 years. If these children were educated in our most expensive Private School (Rowland Hall), the cost would rise to \$120,373,114,725 at \$204,805 per student, or \$9,259,470,363 per year.

ALTERNATIVE COST: \$2,656,589,768 to \$9,259,470,363 per year.

Cost Avoidance (Alternative Yearly Cost, Private Sector)	\$ 2,656,589,768
Gross Yearly Benefit, K-12 Education (Benefits plus Cost Avoidance)	11,916,060,131
Net Benefit (Gross Benefit minus USOE and MSP costs)	8,480,934,630
Benefit / Cost	22.2

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: Title II, Part A**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, places significant emphasis on teacher and leader quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The Title II, Part A legislation focuses on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and requires states to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching core academic subjects are “*highly qualified*.” The Title II, Part A program serves all Utah students and educators through distribution of funds using the Utah Consolidated Application. LEAs use Title II, Part A money to implement activities such as conduct an effective assessment of LEA professional development, recruiting, and hiring needs; develop and implement initiatives to promote retention of highly qualified teachers and principals; ensure this needs assessment drives the development of sound multi-year program plans that (a) include teacher mentoring and incentives, as well as provision of professional development in subject-matter content and effective instruction strategies that are based on scientifically based research, and (b) focus particular attention on addressing below level high-risk students; continually examining standards, assessments, curricula, and teaching practices to ensure alignment; institute merit pay programs, tenure reforms, financial incentives, and special mentoring support; reduce class sizes in kindergarten through third grade; and subsidize professional development for educators in private schools.

The program is authorized through:

- Federal Regulation: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title II
  - Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
    - Sections 2101-2103
    - Subpart 1 – Grants to States
      - Sections 2111-2113
    - Subpart 2 – Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies
      - Sections 2121-2123
  - Part E – Uniform Provisions
    - Sections 9501 and 9503
- Federal Regulation: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title II and Title IX
  - Part A – Definitions of many terms used in the ESEA
  - Part B – Provisions regarding consolidation of administrative funds
  - Part C – Provisions regarding consolidated State and local plans and applications
  - Part D – Provisions regarding waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements
  - Part E – Uniform Provisions
- Federal Regulation: Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)
  - Parts 74-77, 79-82, 84, 86, and 97-99

The program is authorized through Utah State Code: 53A-1-401. Implementation is governed by Board Rule R277-426.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Title II, Part A implementation is accomplished through the following functions completed by the Teaching and Learning Section:

- Collect, review, and accept 131 LEA applications for Title II, Part A funding totaling \$11.2 million
- Provide technical assistance, support, and guidance for completion of the LEAs' application
- Confirm that all educators funded by Title II, Part A are Highly Qualified as required by federal regulations
- Review individual plans for educators that are not Highly Qualified
- Ensure implementation of goals and \_\_\_\_ as determined in the needs assessment
- Provide supervision of program compliance, fiscal compliance, and issue resolution
- Monitor LEA compliance to application assurances through electronic submissions and site visits
- Ensure that all educators working with students are appropriately licensed/endorsed for their assignment
- Coordinate with other Federal Title programs

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

The Utah State Office of Education Teaching and Learning section is responsible to report complete an annual state report to the Secretary of the US Department of Education and to provide additional reports and other data upon request. The annual report is submitted in conjunction with other federal Title programs and includes:

- Annual progress of the LEAs as a whole and each of the schools served by the LEA in meeting measurable objectives
- A State annual report card that includes:
  - Aggregated student achievement
  - Information providing a comparison between actual achievement and the State's annual measurable objectives for groups of students
  - Percentage of students not tested
  - Most recent 2-year trend in student achievement
  - Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State
  - Graduation Rates
  - Information on the performance of local education agencies in the State
  - Professional qualifications of teachers in the State

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- Increase in recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers and principals through support of Promises to Keep and Educator Effectiveness work
- Boost the number of highly qualified teachers in classrooms through offering compensation for completing endorsement courses and required educator license tests
- Reform teacher and principal certification programs through partnerships and collaboration with Utah Institutions of Higher Education (IHE)

- Increase the number of highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools
- Improve the effectiveness of teachers and principals by holding LEAs and schools accountable for improvements in student academic achievement and increasing their numbers of highly qualified teachers and leaders
- Foster student achievement through class size reduction in Kindergarten through third grade
- Support LEAs to ensure that all students, especially children of poverty and of color, have equitable opportunities to be taught by highly effective teachers
- Promote highly qualified and effective teachers in private schools
- Support LEAs in retaining highly qualified teachers

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds</li> <li>• Federal Funds</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul>	\$ \$15,249,018 \$
Total Funding (FY012)	\$15,249,018

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Program Expenses</li> </ul>	\$66,531 \$3,000 \$1,700 \$15,177,997 (to LEAs and IHEs)
Total Costs	\$15,249,018

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- This money is given directly to SEAs, to be sub-granted to LEAs and IHEs. Therefore, LEAs and IHEs would lose over \$15 million dollars to support teachers becoming highly qualified, reducing class size, improving recruitment of highly qualified teachers, and supporting private school professional development

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

- There is no savings to the LEAs if the program does not exist at the State level.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

- The 136 LEAs receive a total of \$15.2 million to be spent at the local level to support teachers becoming highly qualified, reduce class sizes, and monetary support to complete endorsement

courses. This is a total savings of \$11,167,820.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

- LEAs would be responsible for all professional development to get teachers highly qualified, including salary increases or bonuses to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers. They would also have to find other funding to hire additional teachers to reduce class sizes. This would be a total loss to 136 LEAs and Institutes of Higher Education of \$15.2 million.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

- Ultimately, the loss of Title IIA program funding is \$15,249,018 in federal funds infused into Utah's Public Education System
- Overall benefits and support related to program implementation:
  - Increase in recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers and principals through support of Promises to Keep and Educator Effectiveness work
  - Boost the number of highly qualified teachers in classrooms through offering compensation for completing endorsement courses and required educator license tests
  - Reform teacher and principal certification programs through partnerships and collaboration with Utah Institutions of Higher Education (IHE)
  - Increase the number of highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools
  - Improve the effectiveness of teachers and principals by holding LEAs and schools accountable for improvements in student academic achievement and increasing their numbers of highly qualified teachers and leaders
  - Foster student achievement through class size reduction in Kindergarten through third grade
  - Support LEAs to ensure that all students, especially children of poverty and of color, have equitable opportunities to be taught by highly effective teachers
  - Promote highly qualified and effective teachers in private schools
  - Support LEAs in retaining highly qualified teachers

Benefit-Cost: 213

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: Title II, Part B Federal funds - Mathematics and Science Partnership Grants**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The U.S. Department of Education's Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program is administered by the Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Program (AITQ) in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title II, Part B. The goal of the MSP program is to improve academic achievements of elementary and secondary students in mathematics and science by increasing instructional quality. Ultimately, the goal of each project is to provide professional development that will improve instruction in order to increase student achievement in science and mathematics through a partnership project involving an LEA and College of Math, Science, and/or Engineering from an institute of higher education.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Support Utah's participation in the Mathematics and Science Partnership grants through facilitation of a community committee to review project grant applications.
- Provide training sessions to community partners to promote new and diverse applicants and projects during the application period.
- Monitor the distribution and use of federal funds associated with
- Maintain contact with project principal investigators and oversee fidelity of projects to the RFP.
- Approve reimbursement requests based on adherence to proposal and the requirements set forth by Title II, B.
- Support project implementation and promotion of data from the projects to support research-based policies and practices within the larger science and math education community.
- Review federal reports and provide feedback to projects before submission to U.S. Department of Education
- 

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Each project submits an Annual Progress Report (APR) through an online database that is administered by the Utah State Office of Education MSP Coordinator. The report includes data on participation and impact within the K-12 math and science population in Utah, along with research-based outcomes that provide insight into future professional development efforts to help support improved STEM education in the state of Utah. Each report is reviewed by the Utah State Office of Education MSP Coordinator and submitted to the Department of Education

on an annual basis to demonstrate outcomes and maintain funding levels for the state of Utah.

- The MSP Coordinator also updates and maintains the project administration website that promotes the Utah projects within the national education community, as per guidelines from the US Department of Education.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

Performance Measures used to gauge progress to outcome: Data is collected each year by specific project grantee and submitted at the end of each grant cycle to USOE as part of an overall report. Data is project specific but may include measures such as number of endorsements earned, number of teachers served in professional development, increase in number of focused science lessons taught, observation of inclusion of improved teaching methods, etc.

Five year history of performance measure data, including target accomplishments: Projects are multi-year grants. Data is submitted at the end of each grant cycle via an Annual Progress Report (APR) to NSF.

MSP Projects funded over the last five years:

- Physical Science Inquiry Academy
- Connecting With Ecology and Science Teaching
- Partnership for Effective Science Teaching
- Utah Math Endorsement Program
- Elementary Math Endorsement for Ogden Teachers
- Comprehensive Mathematics Instruction
- Science Plus
- Science Plus II
- Northern Utah Science Teaching Laboratory Initiative
- Embedded Alliance for Science Teaching
- Collaborative Program Leading to a Master of Science for Secondary School Mathematics Teachers
- Teachers As Scientists Program
- Teaching Statistics in the Math Common Core
- Elementary Math Endorsement
- STEM Integration Project
- Hawkwatch International Teaching Statistics in the New Common Core
- Logan Elementary Math Endorsement
- Utah Focused Earth Science Resources

Projects have yielded the following impact in FY 2013:

- Professional Development Provided to 743 Utah Teachers
- Teachers involved in the project impacted 42,247 students in K-12 math and science education.
- The Comprehensive Math Instruction model (project in association with Brigham Young

University) was implemented by Core Academy, reaching an additional 3,624 teachers with improved Utah research-based pedagogy and professional development for delivering math instruction.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$ 0
• Federal Funds* (pass through funding)	\$ 1,151,366.00*
• State Appropriation Funds	\$ 13,095.59
Total Funding	\$ 1,164,461.59

**Section Costs: (10% of the Science Specialist Position in Teaching and Learning)**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 10,771.41
• Travel Expenses	\$ 418.64
• Current Expenses	\$ 526.80
• Other Charges	\$ 1,378.74
Total Costs	\$13,095.59

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

- Without a state coordinator, the Department of Education would not provide the formula funding to the projects within the state of Utah. There would not be an entity to oversee the dispersal, application, and evaluation of these funds. Therefore, the state of Utah would lose \$1,151,366.00 in funds that go towards improving teacher content knowledge and professional development for K-12 math and science teachers in the state of Utah.
- Apart from the loss of funds, the state would also lose out on the valuable research that is contributed to the state education community and other professional development efforts by districts and schools that utilize this research to provide more effective professional development opportunities for math and science teachers. This would lead to a loss in community-based education research that would impact the quality of professional development in our state, leading to a potential lowering of teacher quality and in turn teacher effectiveness for student learning in math and science.
- The number of projects that involve partnerships between higher education institutions and K-12 LEA's would decrease within the state, having a negative impact on communication and collaboration between K-12 and state universities and colleges.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

- The money that is provided for the MSP program through federal funds through the U.S. Department of Education flows directly to the projects for their education efforts.
- Typical grant administration fees in the education industry average 25% for the functions performed by the Math Science Partnership Program Coordinator.
  - \$1,151,366.00 (Total Amount for MSP Grant from the US Department of Education)
  - $X \quad 25\%$   
\$287,841.50 for typical administrative fees
- Based on the projected administrative fees associated with the Math Science Partnership Administration, the Utah State Office of Education administration of this program saves \$274,745.91 in costs.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

- The program avoids the cost of higher education institutions and K-12 LEA's employing grant writers to be able to compete for other similar funding available through competitive grants (Department of Education i3 grants, National Science Foundation Math and Science Partnership Grants, etc.)
  - \$ 25,000 (average salary for a half-time grant writer)
  - $X \quad 136$  (41 districts + 95 charter schools)  
\$3,400,000 for half-time grant writers
- Based on the projected in cost associated with grant writers for the LEA's, the Utah State Office of Education administration of this project saves \$3,400,000 to K-12 LEA's to provide state level access to these funds and training associated with grant-writing for the RFP.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:**

- Typical grant administration fees in the education industry average 25% for the functions performed by the Math Science Partnership Program Coordinator.
- \$1,151,366.00 (Total Amount for MSP Grant from the US Department of Education)  
 $X \quad 25\%$   
\$287,841.50 for typical administrative fees
- This cost would need to be covered by an outside agency or University housing the program for administration fees. Aside from the additional cost, it would decrease the amount of funds available to the projects in Utah for improving math and science professional development, thus lowering the number of teacher and students impacted and the research gained from MSP.
- 

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

- Housing this program with the Utah State Office of Education saves a projected total of \$287,841.50 in administrative fees as well as \$3,400,000 in fees that would be incurred by the districts and charter schools in hiring grant writers to gain access to these funds from a national competitive grant system.

• Benefit –	• \$3,687,841.50 -	• = <b>Net Benefit</b>
Section	\$13,095.59	<b>of</b>
Costs:		<b>\$3,674,745.91</b>

- The benefits include impacting over 4,000 K-12 math and science teachers for professional development and a predicted 120,000 students with improved classroom instruction in math and science.
- The program also provides community-based research in math and science education for teachers to provide increased knowledge to the community.

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning**

**Program: University Accreditation and Education Preparation Program Approval**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The Utah State Office of Education provides over-site and program approval for educator preparation programs wishing to make direct recommendations for Utah Educator Licenses and program endorsements. The State Board of Education requires national accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Teaching and Learning staff members represent Utah on the CAEP State Partnership Board and monitor the accreditation status of Utah preparation programs. They represent USOE as members of national review teams for CAEP accreditation.

All activities of this program link to Utah Codes and State Board rule:

Utah Code: 53A-6-108. Prohibition of use of degrees from unapproved Institutions.

Utah Code: 53A-6-107. Program approval

State Board Rule: R277-503-4. Licensing Routes

State board Rule: R277-502. Educator Licensing and Accredited Schools.

State Board Rule: R277-504. Licensing of Specialty Areas.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

Implementation of applicable provisions of Utah Code and Utah State Board of Education rule are accomplished by:

- Consulting with CAEP as a member of the State Partnership Council. Represent the state of Utah in the development of a new national accrediting body, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).
- Monitoring the accreditation status of Utah institutions.
- Monitoring program standards for Utah educator preparation institutions and evaluate their alignment with policy.
- Reviewing the applications of educator preparation programs seeking initial Utah approval.
- Monitoring and auditing university preparation program compliance with State Board policy.
- Reporting to State Board of Education on required policy updates as needed.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Report preparation program compliance with Utah Code and Board Rule to USOE administration.

- Report the national accreditation status of university preparation programs to USOE administration on a regular basis and to the State Board of Education as requested.

**Benefits Provided by Program or Section:**

The work of the Teaching and Learning staff assures that educator preparation programs prepare prospective educators to meet state requirements for basic skills, content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and appropriate professional dispositions. Staff members assure that all educator preparation programs approved to recommend for Utah Educational Licensure are fully accredited by an approved national accrediting organization.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

• State Education Funds	\$
• Federal Funds	\$ 25,125.63
• Other (Describe):	\$
Total Funding	\$

**Section Costs:**

• Personnel Costs	\$ 22,893.63
• Travel Expenses	\$
• Current Expenses	\$ 2,232.00
• Other Charges	\$
Total Costs	\$ 25,125.63

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Failure of USOE to fulfill the requirements in Utah Code and State Board Rule, university educator preparation programs would not be monitored for compliance with Utah statute and Utah State Board rule. There would be no coordination between programs and there would be no assurance of university educator preparation programs meeting uniform state program quality requirements.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

- If beginning teachers are effective in supporting student progress, students are more likely to make progress and need less remediation. If even 5% of students need additional tutoring and re-teaching because of ineffective initial instruction, it would amount to 30,000 students per year in need of remediation. If their needs were met with tutoring and summer school programs, the costs could amount to a minimum of \$500 per student for a possible total of \$15,000,000.
- Effective educator preparation limits the need for development of basic skills by employing LEAs and the need for additional professional development for beginning teachers. Professional development for teachers can cost approximately \$400 per course. If additional skills instruction were needed for all 12,933 beginning teachers because of inadequate university preparation, the yearly total could amount to \$5,173,200 beyond what is currently spent per year for teacher skill development.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- When teachers are well-prepared to supply effective instruction, students are less likely to need re-teaching and remediation.
- Beginning teachers who are more effective earlier in their careers create a cost savings for their employers by limiting the need for additional mentoring, coaching, and basic skill development.
- When beginning teachers feel prepared and competent in their work, they are less likely to become discouraged and seek other employment. Teachers become more effective in their instructional skills as they become more experienced.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

If program standards were not set and national accreditation not required and monitored, there would be no assurance of quality or comparability among programs. Individual districts would need to evaluate the quality of program graduates prior to hiring. If evaluation of new graduates could be purchased from a vendor of educational evaluation services, it would cost approximately \$500 per new teacher. Alternative costs would amount to as much as \$2,000,000 per year assuming approximately 4,000 newly hired teachers per year statewide.

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Estimated Program or System Savings: \$20,173,000

Estimated Alternative Cost Savings: \$2,000,000

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Licensing - Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission (UPPAC)**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

- **UPPAC Educator Allegation of Misconduct Investigations.** When a licensed educator is alleged to have violated Utah Educator Standards R277-515, if directed by the Commission to investigate, a Report is presented to the Commission with findings and conclusions. UPPAC's Investigator gathers relevant evidence to support a recommendation of disciplinary action that the Commission can then review and agree upon a stipulated agreement. Information is received from face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, or written statements.
- **UPPAC Advisory to the Utah State Board of Education.** The Commission reviews the investigative report, with the recommendation of Suspension or Revocation and all findings and conclusions and presents the recommendation to the State Board of Education for review and final decision.
- **Establish procedures regarding complaints against educators and licensing hearings.** If an investigation cannot be resolved through a Stipulated Agreement, the licensed educator can request a hearing for a UPPAC Panel to review the case. An administrative hearing is held with an objective Hearing Officer who writes up the summary of the hearing and the recommendation of the Hearing Panel.
- **Criminal background checks clearance and review.** To be granted a license, license renewals, pre-service applications, and ARL applications all require a background check. All educator/potential arrest information is reviewed by UPPAC for potential licensing action. All records are maintained by the State Office of Education if additional licensing action is needed to be considered for future arrests.
- **Self-reported Arrests/Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI) recent arrests and Warrant review.** UPPAC receives notice from BCI of recent arrest of licensed educators, if the educator is currently teaching in the classroom and still has an open court case an expedited hearing is scheduled to talk with the educator and their employing School District to ensure this is a onetime incident and recommend any potential licensing action.
- **Liaison between Universities and Human resources directors.** UPPAC is charged with notifying school districts of any licensing action taken against an employee of the district. In pre-service and ARL background checks, UPPAC notifies the University/pre-service program of clearance in the program.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Title 53A-Chapter 6: Educator Licensing and Professional Practices Act
  - Section 53A-6-301- UPPAC established to assist and advise board in professional practices issues
  - Section 53A-6-306- directs the Commission to adopt rules to carry out its responsibilities

- under the law. Purpose, powers, and duties of UPPAC
- Section 53A-6-305- directs the meeting of the Commission
- Section 53A-6-402 & 403- disseminate misconduct information regarding misconduct to school officials, tie-in with Criminal Investigations and Technical Services Division
- Section 53A-6-405- UPPAC’s role in the denial of an educator license
- Title 53A-3-410: Criminal background checks on school personnel

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- Board action including Revocation and Suspensions of and educator license is reported to the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). NASDTEC is a searchable database and restricted to agencies responsible for educator certification and discipline.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

The UPPAC Section, made up of one full-time attorney/investigator, one part-time attorney, one part-time administrative assistant and one half time (paid hourly) attorney/investigator, provide multiple benefits to the public education system:

- Advertises for UPPAC positions; vet and recommend applicants to State Superintendent for appointment; schedule UPPAC meetings; provide training and work with UPPAC members to carry out advisory responsibilities with the State Board of Education
- Works with higher education institution, alternative licensing programs, out-of-state applicants to receive and review background checks and specifically consider and evaluate whether background offenses should prevent prospective educators from continuing in a licensing program
- UPPAC investigators review and investigate written complaints against Utah educators when educators are accused of professional and/or legal misconduct
- UPPAC staff schedules hearings and other administrative proceedings if requested by educators accused of misconduct—such hearings both provide information about the alleged misconduct and provide due process for accused educators—resulting in a fair system that protects children and the public school system. The process provides adequate due process for accused educators and multiple opportunities for them to defend themselves and explain their behavior
- UPPAC is an ADVISORY committee, provided for in State law, to make recommendations to the State Board of Education that has responsibility for licensing educators

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

State Education Funds	\$340,000
Federal Funds	
Other (Describe): Office supplies and hardware	
Total Funding	\$340,000

**Section Costs:**

Personnel Costs	\$213,900.00
Travel Expenses	\$ 6,600.00
Current Expenses	\$119,500.00
Other Charges (Supplies and hardware)	\$
Total Costs	\$340,000.00

***Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:***

- The State Board of Education would not have an advisory body or a process that provides information to the Board members in making licensing decisions—this includes prospective educators in university pre-service programs, individuals who may have been licensed in other states or other countries and now seek a Utah credential, individuals in alternative licensing programs and prospective educators who are working toward increasingly diverse district-specific and charter school-specific credentials. These people’s criminal offenses, as revealed by background checks, are reviewed by UPPAC (a committee of nine active educators and two community members) on a monthly basis and UPPACs full and part time staff. In a typical month, UPPAC receives the records of approximately 30 people (about 360 people per year) who would like to be Utah educators—and are somewhere in the preparation process. Without this review, the public, parents, other educators would have no assurance that prospective educators can work safely with children and/or that they will be good role models for school children.
- Without UPPAC and the UPPAC process, complaints against educators would go uninvestigated. Possibly, individuals dangerous or threatening to children could remain in both public and private schools and classrooms. Currently, school districts and charter schools (LEAs) do not have the same statutory authority to receive information about the criminal backgrounds of potential educators. Their hiring practices are, in the case of many LEAs, not as thorough or as well-informed as the licensing process. Also, many of the 140+ LEAs do not have the legal expertise to investigate backgrounds to adequately review and evaluate background offenses revealed by fingerprint background checks. This could result in inappropriate or criminal individuals working in schools with children and/or in not allowing individuals who have one, perhaps minor juvenile mistake in their backgrounds, from becoming educators—in a state and world where good and inspiring educators are in demand.
- The UPPAC process provides fairness and due process for educators with problems in their backgrounds. If there were not an appropriate review process, with adequate legal safeguards and procedures, educators could be unjustly accused. This could keep effective and competent teachers out of schools; it could also result in multiple, expensive lawsuits for the State. These prospective teachers deprived of due process could sue the State. Even lawsuits where the State prevails cost considerable State money and resources. A reasonable, conservative estimate of such a lawsuit would be \$10,000 to \$50,000 depending upon the complexity of the issues. Since 1998 when the basics of the current UPPAC process were implemented at the USOE, there have been only two lawsuits filed. In one extensive and costly lawsuit about 10 years ago, the State prevailed on summary judgment in federal court. Still due to more than 10 depositions, a mediation process and attorney time from several Assistant Attorneys Generals with assistance from USOE attorneys over about nine months, the estimated cost was approximately \$100,000. Another lawsuit was filed against UPPAC seeking to enjoin an administrative hearing. The judge granted the temporary injunction, but delayed ruling on the permanent injunction for nine months—effectively continuing the educator’s license suspension.

This simple legal procedure (handled by an Assistant Attorney General for the USOE) cost approximately \$5,000 in attorney fees and court fees.

- The UPPAC process—readily available in state law and administrative rule—gives confidence to parents and the public that teacher problems are appropriately reviewed before teachers are in the classroom. The process also promises teachers that they will be treated fairly.
- The UPPAC process also provides a negotiation process and administrative due process for active Utah educators who are accused of criminal behavior and/or professional misconduct. The UPPAC investigators/attorneys spend many hours questioning accused individuals, questioning witnesses (often children and students), reviewing documents and records of alleged misdeeds, negotiating with the accused or their attorneys, preparing documents to resolve complaints and/or prosecuting cases with UPPAC members as hearing panels. This information is, in the end, provided to State Board members as well prepared and thoroughly researched recommendations—for licensing discipline, for lesser discipline or for dismissal of complaints. UPPAC Investigators/prosecutors investigate and resolve approximately 100 complaints and cases each year.
- Without the UPPAC process, the State Board would have to take full and immediate responsibility for reviewing teachers prior to licensing. This could be done, but State Board members are lay elected officials without specific public education or legal expertise to review background information and provide legal steps for due process. There would be significant time involved for an elected body that should focus on public education policy issues.
- Another implication of a UPPAC-less system would be for the State Board of Education or the USOE to contract out the legal work. Typical legal rates are \$250-\$450 per hour. Additionally many of the issues are closely related to public educator standards, procedures and expectations. The two permanent UPPAC attorneys are also licensed educators, making their skill sets more comprehensive. If contract attorneys also sought the expertise of licensed educators, attorney rates would be even higher.

***Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:***

- UPPAC reviews many background issues that do not require attorney time for investigations, prosecutions or complicated legal analysis. UPPAC members volunteer their time and are experienced and respected educators. If it is accepted that review of educator background issues is desirable and necessary, this work must be done by someone. If reviewers were paid by the hour, the cost to review each (uncomplicated) case by a committee of nine educators and two volunteers, the cost would be a nominal \$50/hour for 10 UPPAC members X 10-20 cases each month. If a privatized UPPAC reviewed 30 cases each month and each case took even .5 hour, the minimal monthly cost of this review would be approximately \$3,250 monthly. This does not account for multiple reviews of cases (necessary in about 10% of the educator background checks), reviews that take longer individually (another 10%) and UPPAC staff time—an administrative assistant and an attorney who spends about 60% for an additional amount of \$120,000 a year to organize and manage complaints against educators and prospective educators. The various UPPAC responsibilities—separate from the investigative/prosecutorial responsibilities—could cost about \$40,000 annually for non-staff time and an additional \$100,000 for staff time.

- If UPPAC or the State Board of Education, which has educator licensing authority, determined to privatize the UPPAC process there would be a need for at least two full time attorneys—in the private sector (approximately \$100,000 each annually), a paralegal (\$50,000 annually), a secretary (\$30,000-\$50,000 annually) and public education consultants (2 @ \$10,000 annually). A privatized UPPAC investigation/prosecution process (excluding legal resources, general office support and expertise—occasionally UPPAC relies on internal auditors and other specialists), would cost a conservative \$300,000 annually.
- There are additional system savings from lawsuits that are avoided by good, experienced attorneys and assistants. Anecdotally, other states have many more lawsuits in the professional practices arena than Utah has experienced. Granted, many states have more school children (though not more school children per capita!) and more teachers. But there are savings from legal actions and lawsuits **that are avoided** with experienced employees and specifically attorneys who have both legal and public education background and training. A projected savings from lawsuits that are avoided could be conservatively estimated at \$200,000-\$1 million annually.

***Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:***

- UPPAC provides a review, investigation and administrative prosecutorial process regarding prospective educator and educator renewal fingerprint background check information and alleged educator misconduct. The value of a process that protects both students and licensed educators—even adequately—is necessary and priceless. These procedures must be provided by a public body that licenses educators and also provides general control and supervision for the public education system. It is difficult to estimate and quantify costs that are avoided because of this system. We do not know how many incidents of misconduct and teachers are kept from public school children due to the procedures, monitoring and training. We can appropriately and fairly assume that the bare minimum of personnel with similar qualifications that currently work with the UPPAC process would be necessary if the Section did not exist. The safety of children and the confidence in the system demands the procedures and qualified personnel currently in place. A reasonable estimate suggests that 10-20 lawsuits from educators and/or parents would result if the State did not provide similar services. The cost of these lawsuits (not considering the damage to the reputation of public education and impossible-to-estimate potential injuries to children) could be between \$100,000 and several million dollars—annually. A single wrongful death suit could cost the State many millions of dollars. The State could not avoid employees or contract employees fulfilling similar UPPAC functions. Any private sector employees with experience and expertise similar to current UPPAC members and staff would be four or five times as costly as current volunteer UPPAC members and UPPAC employees.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

If similar responsibilities were carried out by personnel in the private sector, the following would be necessary:

- a committee of educators (suggested number 11) to meet monthly for 3 hours paid at an average rate of \$50/hour = \$1,650 per meeting X 10 meetings per year = \$16,500 annually for UPPAC [current cost is travel for each member, a substitute teacher for each active teacher (about 6) and donuts or an estimated \$500 per meeting X 10 meetings per year = \$5,000

annually]

- one full time private sector educator/attorney to investigate and prosecutor = (conservatively) \$250,000/annually (salary and benefits)
- one 60% attorney/educator to recommend members, manage the process, select and train hearing officers, provide administrative direction = \$180,000/annually
- one 3/4 time administrative assistant with legal training and/or advanced writing training, excellent computer expertise (current UPPAC administrative assistant has a master's degree) = \$80,000-\$100,000/annually (salary and benefits)
- one hourly attorney investigator (20 hours/week) @ \$100-\$200 per hour = \$3,000/week

TOTAL ALTERNATE (ANNUAL) COSTS = Staff:

\$16,500	(UPPAC-like committee of educators)
\$200,000	(full-time educator/attorney investigator)
\$180,000	(60% time educator/attorney overseer)
\$100,000	(paralegal or master's degree administrative assistant)
\$30,000	(hourly attorney/investigator)
\$20,000-\$40	(financial and education consultants needed in lieu of USOE staff)
<b>\$556,500</b>	<b>TOTAL (annually)</b>

\$1-50 million in savings (depending upon potential danger to students from untrained and unmonitored teachers and/or if only one significant lawsuit is avoided).

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

Section Costs	\$340,000
Alternative Cost	\$556,500
Benefit Cost	1.6 - 147

**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with SB 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Teaching and Learning  
Program: USTAR**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

The purpose of the USTAR program is to provide increased compensation for mathematics and science teachers by providing opportunities for an expanded contract year. The program is designed to enhance LEA ability to attract and retain talented and highly qualified mathematics and science teachers. The Teaching and Learning section STEM Coordinator provides oversight for the program.

The program is authorized through Utah State Code 53A-17a-159 and in USBE Rule R277-492 Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative (USTAR) Centers Program.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

The STEM Coordinator provides oversight for the USTAR Program in the following ways:

- Prepare applications and oversee application process
- Monitor USTAR programs
- Provide technical support to USTAR LEAs
- Gather and collate reports

Note: In FY13 and prior, fiscal analysts aided in allocating appropriate amounts to USTAR awardees. Funds were provided in 1/12<sup>th</sup> increments to LEAs. Beginning in FY14, funds are available to LEAs as reimbursements. This required additional time from both USOE and district personnel, and ensured funds are expended in a timely manner.

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

Yearly reporting to Education Interim and/or Education Appropriations Committee on USTAR expenditures.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

Attracting and retaining talented and highly qualified mathematics and science teachers is critical to the education and preparation of Utah students. The USTAR program facilitates this benefit through increased compensation for mathematics and science teachers by providing opportunities for an expanded contract year.

**Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):**

State Education Funds	\$ 6,209,333 (State Appropriation)
-----------------------	------------------------------------

**Section Cost (restricted to this program):**

Personnel Costs	\$9,048 (5%) of time
Travel Expenses	\$0 (travel)
Current Expenses	\$285 (current expense)
Indirect Cost	\$1225
Pass Through (grants to LEAS)	
Total Costs	\$6,189,379 (grants)

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

Another state agency would have to administer \$6.2 million in USTAR funding that flows directly to LEAs or the funding would need to be repealed resulting in a complete loss of USTAR programs state-wide.

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

Savings to districts by centralized administration is estimated at 13% (based on an average cost of administration for grants) of the total \$6.2 million grant or \$806,000.

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

This program supports remediation and credit recovery programs in the district as well as accelerated opportunities for students.

77,545 Students participated in 2013 in 2,053 days and an additional 79,135 hours of coursework valued at \$5,935,125 based on a \$75/per hour charge for each hour of supplemental education.

**Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section or Programs Functions were not performed:**

If this function were not performed by USOE, a grants manager/evaluator would charge 18%.

\$6.2 million X .18= \$1,116,000

**Summary of Costs and Benefits:**

Total State Expenditures (State funds and section costs): \$9,073 for 5% of coordinator's time

Estimated cost savings: \$806,000 (cost of LEAs administering individual grants)

Credit Recovery Programs: \$5,935,125

Estimated alternative service costs: \$1,117,680 (grant manager would charge 18% of total budget)

<b>Source and Amount of Funds</b>	
State Education Funds	
<b>Section Costs YTD</b>	
Personnel	\$9,073
Indirect Costs	1225
<b>Pass Through</b>	\$6,189,379
<b>Total Cost</b>	10,621
<b>Gross Benefit</b> (benefit plus savings and cost avoidance)	7,867,878
<b>Implications if Section were not to provide noted functions or programs:</b> Grants would be provided without oversight and technical support unless an alternative entity was retained to supply similar services commercially or otherwise. LEAs benefit by receiving more than \$6 million in grant funding.	
<b>Summary of Costs and Benefits:</b>  Cost savings include consulting for grant and program management services, valued at \$1,108,347. Limited centralized administrative costs of \$10,298 are incurred by USOE. Grants are unlikely to be extended without appropriate oversight, in which case the whole value of pass through funding may be considered as a benefit of costs incurred in USOE program administration. For every dollar invested in program administration at USOE plus additional services provided, the state gains \$739.76 in benefit, when both direct benefits and cost avoidance are considered.	
<b>Total Cost</b>	10,621
<b>Net Savings (Gross Benefits minus Costs)</b>	\$7,857,257
<b>Benefits to Cost Ratio</b>	739.76



**Benefit-Cost Report for Programs within USOE  
(In compliance with S.B. 2 of the 2012 Legislature)**

**Section: Youth in Custody**

***Description of Section Functions, Programs and Statutory provisions fulfilled:***

*State Supported Minimum School Program II. Related To Basic School Programs C. Special Populations  
10. Youth At-Risk Programs e. Youth In Custody*

**Functions:**

- The function of the Youth-In-Custody (YIC) line item is to provide compulsory educational services to persons under the age of 21 who are in the custody of the Department of Human Services (DHS) [Division of Child and Family Services & Division of Juvenile Justice Services], an equivalent agency of a tribe recognized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or a juvenile detention facility.
- LEAs with YIC students (that meet the strict statutory eligibility criteria) apply annually to the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) to provide compulsory education services to these out-of-home students. All educational services are provided through existing established accredited schools operating within an LEA. Applications are reviewed annually by USOE staff and the USBE designee as well as by the statutory advisory: the Utah Coordinating Council for Youth in Custody.

**Programs:**

- Division of Juvenile Justice Services: Secure Care, Observation & Assessment, Locked Detention, Youth Services, Work Camp, and Community Programs.
- Division of Child and Family Services: Foster Care, Youth Services, Shelter, Private Providers and the Utah State Hospital.
- Division of Indian Affairs

**Statutory provisions fulfilled:**

- 53A-11-101.5. Compulsory education.
- 53A-2-201. Child's school district of residence -- Determination -- Responsibility for providing educational services.
- 53A-1-403. Education of persons under 21 in custody of state agency -- Establishment of coordinating council -- Advisory councils.
- 62A-15-609. Responsibility for education of school-aged children at the hospital -- Responsibility for non-instructional services.
- Rule R277-709. Education Programs Serving Youth in Custody.
- Rule R547-1. Residential and Nonresidential, Non-secure Community Program Standards.

***State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section:***

- Ensure that LEAs eligible for YIC funds are in compliance with state and federal statute and rule
- Awarding of YIC funds to LEAs using a resource-based funding formula determined by: safety and security ratios, care & treatment functions, bi-weekly custodial reports, DHS licensing

reports, and annual student-information-system data.

- Maintain fiscal responsibility for all personnel and program budgets (SEA & LEA)
- Technical assistance, program and data monitoring ensuring rule compliance and target accomplishment.
- Centralized student record management via the Youth in Custody S3 Record system ensuring accurate data collecting, reporting and data matching capabilities with allied agencies.
- Fiscal monitoring of MSP funds through reimbursement of qualified expenses
- Program compliance monitoring assuring appropriate usage of YIC funding via state desk audits and on-site program monitoring

***State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section:***

- The Youth in Custody (YIC) line item is a support to the public education service continuum in the State of Utah and not a stand-alone program per se. Students served by this line item are wards of the State of Utah and are further defined as out-of-home youth. Even with the dynamic logistical challenges this population faces, YIC students are part of the statewide instruction, assessment, accountability and data reporting mechanisms in place for all public education students. Target accomplishments and performance measure data are available via the Superintendent's Annual Report.
- UTREX data:
  - (1) Youth in Custody (S3) Record: This Data Clearinghouse Record provides the following data on YIC students: the custody type, the amount of time a student is served, environment, and the reason a student exited YIC-related services.
- Out-of-home youth graduation outcomes for K-12 reporting aiding in the reduction the SEA and LEA dropout rates.
- Educational Outcomes for Children in the Care of the Department of Human Services and its Divisions: Data Match Report.

***Benefits Provided by Program or Section:***

- State/centralized assurance of compulsory education provision to youth-in-care
- State/centralized collaboration/coordination with allied state agencies [Department of Human Services: Division of Juvenile Justice Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Division of Indian Affairs, Department of Workforce Services and the Department of Health.]
- State/centralized collection and reporting of program data and outcomes
- Consistency of program standards implemented and maintained statewide in compliance with existing statute and the dynamic nature of administrative rule
- Technical assistance as requested/required
- Maintenance of regulatory compliance (fiscal & programmatic)
- Professional development available to all programs based on programs' needs and monitoring findings

***Source and Amount of Funding (Education Fund, Federal Funds, Etc.):***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Education Funds (MSP)</li> <li>• Other (Describe):</li> </ul>	\$18,321,000 \$ 0
Total Funding	\$18,321,000

**Section Costs:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel Costs</li> <li>• Travel Expenses</li> <li>• Current Expenses</li> <li>• Other Charges [Indirect Cost]</li> </ul>	\$110,371 \$7127 \$38,410 \$13,576
Total Costs	\$169,484

**Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs:**

The State Board of Education is “directly responsible” for the education of “youth in custody” [53A-1-403]. Utah is one of seventeen (17) states with a centralized education system serving students in care where the State Education Agency (SEA) is solely responsible. This structure allows for the real-time adjustment of funding and compulsory education services needed to counter the relentless change that permeates the system of care serving these unique students. This structure also provides for the requisite coordination with the other allied state agencies serving this population to ensure all students have access to a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE).

- Loss of regulatory function (fiscal and programmatic)
- Loss of program continuity and ability for programs to best meet the needs of youth-in-care
- Loss of centralized education system ensuring FAPE in compliance with Utah statutory obligations for compulsory education
- Potential for program funding inequities and misappropriation of funds to ineligible students and private entities

**Estimated Program or System Savings from Section Functions:**

- Non-duplicated monitoring services by 25 programs
- Consistency across all programs assuring that student needs are consistently met and collected/reported statewide

**Estimated Program or System Cost Avoidance from Section Functions:**

- State less likely to meet the governor's goal to increase the number of educated and qualified workforce by 2020
- Economic loss in state revenues through decrease to the number of persons economically contributing to the state by paying or increasing the amount of state taxes resulting in an increase in the number of persons accessing and relying on welfare services

- Inability for youth-in-care to receive the requisite education to fulfill the requirements for a high school diploma resulting in their inability to enroll in post-secondary institutions or obtain employment.
- Any reduction in funding will severely hamper the USBE, the Utah State Office of Education and the Department of Human Services in meeting their statutory obligation to provide compulsory education to a population that is arguably, the neediest in the State of Utah.

***Estimated Alternative Costs if the Section Functions or Programs were not performed:***

1. At a minimum - increase district program staff to (sample projection based on program x FTE cost = total):

- A. Complete program compliance monitoring (25 x \$75,000 = \$1,875,000)
- B. Maintain data management, student record compliance, (25 x \$75,000 = \$1,875,000)
- C. Offer required professional development (including test administration training and recalibration; curriculum development and standardization at a minimum 25 x 75,000 = \$1,875,000)

***Summary of Costs and Benefits:***

1. In the absence of controlled experimental data on the number of career criminals averted, the key question becomes how many career criminals must be prevented before an intervention program pays for itself. Based on a 2- percent discount rate, the typical career criminal results in \$1.3 to \$1.5 million in external costs, a heavy drug user \$370,000 to \$970,000, and a high school dropout \$243,000 to \$388,000. Eliminating duplication between crimes committed by individuals who are both heavy drug users and career criminals results in an overall estimate of the monetary value of saving a high-risk youth of \$1.7 to \$2.3 million.
2. Increase in academic levels affects the labor market participation through both taxpayer expenditure and revenue. On the expenditure side increased employment reduces taxpayer expenditures on human services, corrections, courts, employment and family services as well as health services expenditures. An increase in education and subsequent employment increases sales tax, income tax and corporate taxes.<sup>2</sup>
3. Workers without a high school diploma earn a median income of \$20,250 compared to \$27,960 with a high school diploma and compared to \$48,100 for those with a bachelor's degree.
4. Graduating from high school decreases the likelihood of welfare by 77%.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cohen, M.A. 1998. *The monetary value of saving a high-risk youth. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. Vol. 14, No. 1*

<sup>2</sup> *Economic Effects of Adult Education in Utah, Richard Fowles, University of Utah, 2012*

<sup>3</sup> *Utah Office of Vocational and Adult Education National Reporting Systems 2010 annual report*

<sup>4</sup>Source: [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09\\_385.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_385.asp)

<sup>5</sup>Source [http://www.caputah.org/uploads/325866\\_Education.pdf](http://www.caputah.org/uploads/325866_Education.pdf)