

Consolidated State Application

September 1, 2003 Submission

**For State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

Due: September 1, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

**Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application
September 1, 2003 Submission**

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

**Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS**

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)**

STATE RESPONSE

In the State of Utah, we have completed several phases of a development plan to write and align English language proficiency (ELP) levels with the state's K-12 Core curriculum. This process includes articulation of ELP levels, development and alignment of ELP standards with the Core curriculum, internal review, external review, field-testing, and adoption of the aligned and reviewed ELP standards by the Utah State Board of Education.

From January to June 2003, the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) initiated development of ELP standards for the K-12 language arts Core curriculum. Nancy L. Giraldo, Title III Director, and Dr. Magaly Lavandenz, acting as the internal facilitator, from Loyola Marymount University (Los Angeles, CA) prepared and invited K-12 public school teachers and administrators, university experts, and community partners to participate in Utah's English Language Development Benchmarks Committee. Generally, public school educators were on the writing team, and university and community members served as an advisory board. Dr. Annela Teemant from Brigham Young University served on both committees as an external facilitator. The invited participants had expertise in the fields of second language acquisition, bilingual/ESL education, language arts, teaching and learning, or teacher preparation.

The design of the ELP Standards was based on John Carr's (WestEd) process of standard mapping. This model uses a grade span approach (k-2; 3-6; 7-9; 10-11) in writing the ELP standards. The writing committee first articulated definitions for five levels of English Language Proficiency. Using these definitions, the writing committee then developed grade span ELP standards that were aligned with the state's K-12 language arts curriculum. Utah's K-12 Language Arts standards are divided by domain: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. All four domains are aligned in Utah's ELP standards. The writing team engaged in a process of development and revision.

Following development and alignment of the ELP standards for language arts, a local internal review was conducted with the help of professors in the field of reading and language acquisition and community groups, such as the Coalitions of Minorities (advisory to the State

Board), Centro de la Familia (non-profit organization), the Utah Governor's Ethnic Affairs Office for Education and the Utah State Office Curriculum, Special Education, Evaluation & Assessment, and Student Achievement and School Success staff from the USOE. Based on feedback, revisions were made by the writing team, leading to the completion of the K-12 ELP standards for language arts. An external review of the ELP language arts standards is in progress by John Carr of WestEd. Additionally, Utah's ELP standards in language arts will be field tested during the 2003-2004 academic year in elementary, middle, and high school settings to improve the quality of the standards.

Utah has a process of establishing new standards in content areas as well as the ELP standards. The process includes Utah State Board of Education approval and the development of an implementation plan with LEA support. This process is underway and will allow for the pilot process described above to occur.

The ELP standards for language arts were submitted to Ms. Elizabeth Judd, Utah Program Officer from Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) at the U.S. Department of Education. Ms. Judd recommended the addition of academic language, skills, and functions, leading to the additional development of mathematics and science ELP standards. The State of Utah has designed a plan to accomplish this task. New writing and advisory committees composed of higher education professors in the areas of mathematics and science along with a group of credentialed and highly qualified content-area and ELL educators will be organized during the 2003-2004 academic year. These committees will develop and align ELP standards for mathematics and science. These ELP standards will also be internally and externally reviewed, and finally, all ELP standards will be submitted to the Utah State Board of Education for approval.

An additional point of interest is that the Mountain West Consortium of which Utah is a part is currently developing a new English language proficiency test. This test will measure both English proficiency and academic achievement in the content-areas. The plan is to have alignment between this test and ELP standards, allowing cut scores to be set. The test content will be closely aligned with the ELP standards, and proficiency levels will be established accordingly.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
ELP Assessment(s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4
(1)*	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
IPT	45341	6289 (13.9%)	19075 (42.1%)	7541 (16.6%)	12436 (27.4%)

*

- (1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.
- (2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated “Proficient” should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

Utah uses the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT), published by Ballard and Tighe at all grades and in all school districts. The domains tested are listening and speaking (aggregated as an Oral score), Reading, and Writing. Grade spans/grades in use are: Reading and Writing K-1, 2-3, 4-6, 7-12; Oral K-6, 7-12.

2. Total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

Approximately 44,000 students were assessed for English language proficiency in Utah during the 2002-2003 school year.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

Approximately 44,000 students were assessed for English language proficiency in Utah during the 2002-2003 school year. Students are identified as LEP based on the score achieved on the IPT and the results of a home language survey.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**
-

STATE RESPONSE

Utah's annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for English language proficiency are based on existing data from the IPT test used to identify and assess LEP students. These data are submitted to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) by districts indicating proficiency levels achieved, not actual scores. This practice limits USOE's ability to fully understand the progress made by students in the past. However, below is described our plan for making adjustments to data submission to enable USOE to fully report and analyze progress and achievement of AMAOs.

Currently, proficiency levels are reported to USOE. The proficiency levels are a result of work completed in Utah to transform IPT performance descriptors on each subtest to a numeric value and aggregate score. The IPT has three domains: Oral, Reading, and Writing. The Oral subtest includes both listening and speaking skills – thus all four domains are assessed on the IPT. Performance on each subtest was used to sum an assigned value for determining a proficiency level. Four proficiency levels were defined: Level A, Level B, Level C, and Level D. These are the proficiency levels submitted to USOE by districts. See attached table of IPT performance and proficiency levels (Appendix A).

While this process had value and has standardized the identification of student proficiency throughout Utah, it does not adequately allow reporting of progress or achievement of AMAOs. Utah will complete a process to further define how IPT can yield understandable and valuable proficiency levels. First, performance descriptors will be written by teachers and experts in language acquisition that reflect key skills that represent each proficiency level described in

Utah's ELP standards (pre-emergent, emergent, intermediate, fluent, and advanced). Second, the IPT items will be reviewed by experts and educators to determine which skill is being assessed. Finally, teachers will use a bookmarking standard setting method to identify appropriate cut scores for each proficiency level. The bookmarking method has been used in Utah for Core criterion-referenced tests, and is the Utah State Board of Education accepted method. This will result in five proficiency levels rather than the four that are currently used. Standards will be set for four domains, with comprehension resulting from performance in both listening and reading. Performance on listening and reading must be at the fluent level for students to be considered fluent in comprehension.

Proficient will be defined as achievement at an overall level of advanced, with no subtest scores lower than fluent level. At this level of achievement students would be capable of participating in the classroom and having full opportunity to learn academic content.

It should be noted that Utah recognizes that the IPT is not sufficient for assessing academic English proficiency and therefore Utah will adopt a new language proficiency assessment, developed by the Mountain West Assessment Consortium, for this purpose. Upon that adoption, an equating process will be completed to ensure that data are comparable and valid.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

Currently, Utah defines four proficiency levels based on the IPT: Level A, Level B, Level C, and Level D. These levels are determined based on a sum of values assigned to the student's performance on each subtest. See Appendix A. Proficiency levels will be redefined through a standard setting process, aligning the IPT to Utah's ELP standards and accompanying performance descriptors (Appendix B).

Research indicates that students achieve oral proficiency in 3-5 years but require 4-7 years to achieve overall English proficiency (DeAvila, 1997; Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). Therefore, Utah proposes making progress goals and goals for attaining proficiency based on our ELP standards and research in the area of language acquisition.

To establish baseline performance and AMAOs, Utah applied the "20th percentile" rule from the Title I baseline formula. In other words, schools were rank ordered by performance on the IPT. Based on Utah's current data system, Level D was considered proficient. This, of course, will be modified as the plan described in Section C: Performance Targets is implemented. In addition, the data set used for this analysis did not represent every school and district. When those data are available, Utah will re-analyze the data to verify the AMAOs.

Once schools were rank ordered by percent of students "proficient" (at Level D), the cumulative enrollment of ELL students was used to determine the performance of the school at which the 20th percentile student attends. This established our baseline for 2003-2004 school year.

The achievement goals for students attaining English proficiency is based on the 90th percentile of all schools by the 2013-2014 school year. These goals must be considered with Utah's cohort definition as described below.

In compliance with Title III Section 3113 (b)(3)(A), Utah has consulted with and received feedback from: LEAs; community groups including Coalition for Minorities Advisory Committee to the Utah State Board of Education, Centro de la Familia; WestEd (Robert Linqunti); Measured Progress (test contractor for Mountain West Assessment Consortium). These groups and individuals have provided valuable influence on the development of Utah LEP standards, AMAOs, and progress rates.

Beginning Level	Ending Level	Number of Years
Beginning	Pre-Emergent	One
Pre-Emergent	Emergent	Two
Emergent	Intermediate	Two
Intermediate	Advanced	Four
Advanced	Fluent	Four

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same

performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Each year Utah will determine percent proficient by extracting from state level data those students that meet certain criteria. The criteria represent characteristics that indicate that students are within the proximity of fluency. It is not expected that all students possessing these characteristic will attain proficiency in a single year; however, it is within reason to include them in determining Utah's achievement of English proficiency. Percent proficient will be determined by dividing the number of students proficient with the number of students meeting the criteria.

The criteria for including in the denominator are:

- Four or more years in the United States
- At Level C or D in previous year regardless of proficiency for current year
- At Level A or B and reached proficiency in current year

The numerator will be those students who reached proficiency.

Numerator: Proficient students

While the students in each year will not be identical (true cohort), applying this criteria will allow for a matched sample each year.

Utah will have two cohorts of students. These will be an elementary cohort and secondary cohort. Elementary cohort will be made up of students in grades Kindergarten through 6th grade or enrolled in an elementary school as defined by USOE Finance and Statistics. Secondary cohort will be students enrolled in grades 7-12 or in a middle, junior, or high school as defined by USOE Finance and Statistics.

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort:**

Elementary K-6

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans.)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	*see following tables	8.6%
2004-2005 School Year		12.4%
2005-2006 School Year		16.2%
2006-2007 School Year		20.1%
2007-2008 School Year		24.9%
2008-2009 School Year		27.8%
2009-2010 School Year		31.6%
2010-2011 School Year		35.4%
2011-2012 School Year		39.2%
2012-2013 School Year		43.0%
2013-2014 School Year		46.8%

School Year	Percent of Elementary LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency
-------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2003-2004 School Year	75% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

2004-2005 School Year	75% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
2005-2006 School Year	80% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
2006-2007 School Year	80% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

2007-2008 School Year	85% of all <i>elementary students</i> (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	85% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	85% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	85% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	85% of all elementary students (grade pre-K through 6) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one-quarter level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort:**

Secondary 7-12

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	*see following tables	12.5%
2004-2005 School Year		17.1%
2005-2006 School Year		21.6%
2006-2007 School Year		26.2%
2007-2008 School Year		30.7%
2008-2009 School Year		35.3%
2009-2010 School Year		39.8%

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

2010-2011 School Year	44.4%
2011-2012 School Year	48.9%
2012-2013 School Year	53.5%
2013-2014 School Year	58.1%

School Year	Percent of Secondary LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency
-------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2003-2004 School Year	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one- fifth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

2004-2005 School Year	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	75% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one- fifth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

2005-2006 School Year	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one- fifth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

2006-2007 School Year	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	80% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one- fifth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

2007-2008 School Year	85% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the beginning level of English language proficiency will acquire one level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.
	85% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the pre-emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-half level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.

<p>85% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the emergent level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.</p>
<p>85% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the intermediate level of English language proficiency will acquire one-fourth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.</p>
<p>85% of all <i>secondary students</i> (grades 7 through 12) who are at the advanced level of English language proficiency will acquire one- fifth level of language proficiency per year of program service as measured by a state approved English language proficiency assessment.</p>

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)©(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

- A.** In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)©(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)©(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Utah has submitted the percentage of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) assignment of teachers under NCLB subject areas rather than the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers. The information submitted is available from our database of licensed educators; the information needed for the latter percentage is not yet available from our student database.

Utah provides two categories of highly qualified teachers:

Highly qualified status - Given to those educators who have a current Utah license, at least a bachelor’s degree with a major or National Board Certification in core assignments or have successfully passed the appropriate examination(s).

Interim status – Given to those teachers not new to the profession who meet current Utah state standards but do not have a major, or have not passed a state approved test of content in No Child Left Behind (NCLB) core subject assignments.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	95.9% (70.98% Interim; 24.92% Fully HQ)	96.39% (85.31% Interim; 11.08% Fully HQ)
2003-2004 Target	97%	97%
2004-2005 Target	98%	98%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

Utah has submitted the above targets consistent with NCLB requirements but notes that our first priority will be to move unqualified teachers to the highly qualified status. Utah will continue to offer and require participation and completion of state approved endorsement programs (SAEPs) for all teachers currently qualified on an interim basis. Under Utah’s HOUSSSE standards, all interim highly qualified teachers will submit evidence of completion of NCLB content courses during the current license renewal cycle in order to secure a highly qualified status. However, given the remote location of many of Utah’s schools and the configuration of small, isolated or special purpose schools, it is impractical and unreasonable to suggest that all teachers will meet the highly qualified requirements for all courses. Teachers in these settings are typically asked to teach multiple subjects and will not be expected to complete majors in all areas prior to 2006. The USOE will continue to work with LEAs and schools to secure ongoing educational opportunities for these teachers, work to secure alternate course delivery methods to ensure highly qualified teachers in core areas and to strengthen recruitment and retention strategies in these areas.

A significant percentage of teachers currently qualified on an interim basis are elementary teachers who have not completed a major in an NCLB content area beyond their elementary education/early childhood major. As described below, these teachers will be granted fully highly qualified status upon completion of 6 semester hours of additional coursework and/or professional development in an NCLB content area within their current 5-year re-licensure cycle. As teachers will only be able to achieve fully highly qualified states at the point of re-licensure, approximately 40% of teachers will not be eligible to receive the designation prior to the 2005-2006 school year.

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State’s definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

Current state standards for and elementary/early childhood education licensed teachers require a major in elementary/ early childhood education but do not require a major in a specific core area beyond the elementary education major. Under Utah’s HOUSSSE, elementary/ early childhood teachers with an elementary or early childhood major will move to NCLB highly qualified status upon submission of six semester hours of district-approved NCLB content credit or upon passage of a state approved content and pedagogy test. Districts have the option of reviewing student test scores, school improvement plans, and other federal mandates to determine the specific subject content of the approved credits to be submitted for permanent “highly qualified” status.

Staff at the USOE have been told (verbally) that an elementary education/ early childhood major is insufficient to meet the requirements of the law. With that information, we believe we had no option other

than to identify elementary teachers not new to the profession with an elementary/early childhood education major but no major in a core area as qualified on an interim basis. As each state qualified elementary teacher completes their current license renewal cycle, they will be granted highly qualified status based on their elementary/ early childhood education major and having completed ongoing high quality professional development in a NCLB core area within the their current re-licensure cycle. Utah requests official notification that an elementary education/early childhood is insufficient for elementary teachers to be designated as NCLB highly qualified.

Under current Utah licensure and placement rules, Utah Secondary teachers are required to complete a major, minor, or SAEP in order to be eligible to teach an NCLB core content course. Teachers with a minor or SAEP will not automatically be counted as NCLB highly qualified. Secondary teachers with a minor or completed SAEP in a field consistent with their academic major will be designated as highly qualified for all relevant courses. (i.e. A teacher with a chemistry minor or SAEP with a biology major will be highly qualified for both chemistry and biology by virtue of the minor being in the same general field as the major). However, a teacher with a non- major related completed SAEP or minor will not be considered highly qualified for the not –related courses (i.e. A teacher with a completed chemistry SAEP or minor with an English major will be NCLB highly qualified only in the major area). Teachers in this circumstance will be considered to be highly qualified on an interim basis IF they complete not less than 6 additional semester hours in the minor or endorsement area during any given re-licensure cycle. This interim designation will be in place until a major or the equivalent of a major is earned. At any time, teachers who pass a state approved content area test will be considered highly qualified in that area. Secondary teachers who do not have a minor or have not completed a SAEP in a subject assignment not related to their major will not be considered highly qualified.

A complete outline of the USOE strategy for designating and tracking NCLB highly qualified educators is attached as Appendix C.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	18%
2003-2004 Target	23%
2004-2005 Target	28%
2005-2006 Target	30%

Utah has revised requirements for state approved professional development credit consistent with the NCLB definition of high quality professional development. This revision was implemented statewide in January 2003. As of January 1, 2003, professional development activities that did not conform to the NCLB definition could not be entered into the CACTUS (Computer Aided Credentials for Teachers in Utah Schools; Utah’s electronic teacher quality and educator licensing database) for credit. The data above represents professional development recorded after January 1, 2003 and does not include teacher professional development activities conducted during the summer of 2003.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119© and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate’s (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119© and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	46%
2003-2004 Target	66%
2004-2005 Target	86%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	86.1%
African American/Black	64.8%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	67.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	81.0%
Asian	84.4%
Pacific Islander	76.1%
Hispanic	64.7%
White	88.4%
Other	--
Students with Disabilities	Not available
Students without Disabilities	Not available
Limited English Proficient	Not available
Economically Disadvantaged	Not available
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	Not available
Migrant	Not available
Male	85.1%
Female	87.2%

The approach to calculating the cohort graduation rate displayed above was recommended by NCES for use with aggregate CCD data (which is simply 1 minus the cohort graduation rate) not the traditional event dropout rate is given.

Dropout counts by ethnicity and grade must be estimated because they are not given in the summary reports from which this data set is derived.

Disaggregation of cohort rates by other demographic categories -- disabilities, economic disadvantage, limited English proficiency, and migrancy -- will not be available until 2007 for the Class of 2005 as indicated in Utah's approved AYP Plan.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: graduation rate

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	86.11	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	88%
African American/Black	64.8	66.76	68.85	70.94	73.03	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	67.1	67	68.85	70.94	73.03	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

Asian/Pacific Islander	81.0	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Asian	84.4	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	85.57	88%
Pacific Islander	76.1	76	76	76	76	76	77.2	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Hispanic	64.7	66.76	68.85	70.94	73.03	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
White	88.4	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88%
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Students without Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Limited English Proficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75.12	77.21	79.30	81.39	83.48	85.57	88%
Male	85.1	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85.57	88%
Female	87.2	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	88%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data. Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	NA
African American/Black	NA
American Indian/Native Alaskan	NA
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA
Hispanic	NA
White	NA
Other	NA
Students with Disabilities	NA
Students without Disabilities	NA
Limited English Proficient	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Migrant	NA
Male	NA
Female	NA

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

As indicated by the 1.00 minus the projected graduation rate for the 10 – 12 cohort.

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	NA	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	12
African American/Black	NA	33.24	31.15	29.06	26.97	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
American Indian/Native Alaskan	NA	33	31.15	29.06	26.97	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Asian		16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	14.43	12
Pacific Islander		24	24	24	24	24	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Hispanic	NA	33.24	31.15	29.06	26.97	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
White	NA	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Students without Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Limited English Proficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.88	22.79	20.70	18.61	16.52	14.43	12
Male		15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	14.43	12
Female		13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	12

UTAH - Appendix 1

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY DESCRIPTORS

PRE-EMERGENT/NEP

At this level of English language proficiency, students have limited or no understanding of oral or written English but participate by listening. They may demonstrate comprehension by using a few isolated words or expressions in speech. They typically draw, copy, or respond non-verbally or in their native language to simple commands, statements and questions. They may understand that there is a relationship between oral and written language.

EMERGENT/NEP & LEP

At this level of English language proficiency, students begin to understand that written language represents oral language. They understand and respond to basic social conventions, simple questions, simple directions, and appropriate level texts. They participate in classroom routines. They speak, read, and write using single words, short phrases, or simple sentences with support. They have a minimal expressive vocabulary.

“Low” (INTERMEDIATE)/LEP

At this level of English language proficiency students begin to understand and use more abstract, unfamiliar, academic, and formal language. They participate in content area discussions and tasks. They use simple, comprehensible sentences and questions marked with developmental errors. They understand common words, phrases and every day topics; however, they need continued support to read and write more complex narrative and expository texts.

“Advanced” (High INTERMEDIATE)LEP

At this level of English language proficiency, students understand and use more abstract, academic, and formal language and literacy skills. They participate actively in most social and classroom tasks, using some idioms and more content-specific language in speech and writing. They read and write independently for personal and academic purposes with some persistent errors. With some support, they read and write about various topics, using different genres for a variety of audiences.

“Fluent” (ADVANCED)/FEP

At this level, students have developed proficiency in English language and literacy skills. They may need continued support when engaging in complex academic tasks requiring increasingly academic language.

UTAH - APPENDIX 2

IPT PROFICIENCY POINTS

ESOL Program Placement

English Proficiency LAU	IPT Scores O R W	Proficiency Points	Area of English Limitation	Status
A Beginning	N N N	4.30	Oral (Reading and writing tests not given to "N" Students)	NEP
B Intermediate	LNN LLN LNL LLL LFN LNF FLN FNL FLL FFN FNF	11 10 10 9 8 8 8 8 7 6 6	Oral Reading Writing (in one or more areas)	LEP
C Advanced	LFF FLF FFL	5 5 5	Reading or Writing	LEP
D Proficient	FFF	3	None	FEP
Key:	O=Oral R=Reading W=Writing	Points: N=4 L=3 F=1	NEP=Non English Proficient LEP=Limited English Proficient FEP=Fluent English Proficient	

UTAH – APPENDIX 3

The Utah NCLB Strategy

August 28, 2003

USOE will qualify the **Early Childhood and Elementary license areas** as highly qualified if the educator meets the Utah defined standards for highly qualified elementary/early childhood. When an educator's license area is flagged as NCLB highly qualified, that educator will be highly qualified when teaching any NCLB assignment that requires an Early Childhood or Elementary license without an endorsement.

We will qualify **endorsements** in Fine Arts, World Languages, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies as highly qualified if the educator meets the standards for highly qualified in these subject areas. When an educator's endorsement is flagged as NCLB highly qualified, that educator will be highly qualified when teaching any NCLB assignment that requires that endorsement AND a license area that is held by the educator. For example, if an educator holds an elementary license area and is highly qualified in Earth Science, that educator would be highly qualified for an integrated science grade 8 assignment, but would not be qualified for earth systems grade 9, which requires a middle or secondary license area.

Interim NCLB qualification standards for veteran educators:

Any license area with an interim NCLB qualification, will expire on the date the license expires. At that time USOE Educator Licensing technicians based on documentation submitted by the educator will evaluate the NCLB qualification and the license area will be renewed with the new NCLB qualification.

Early Childhood and Elementary license areas

If, according to CACTUS on August 28, 2003, you:
were employed prior to Aug. 30, 2002 (including prior years) AND
were not an intern AND
held a basic or standard early childhood or elementary license area during the 2002-2003 school year,
your early childhood and/or elementary license area is NCLB qualified for the interim until your current license expires.

Your interim qualification expires on your license expiration date. Until that date OR until you renew your educator license that expires on that date, you will be NCLB highly qualified for any NCLB assignment that requires an early childhood or elementary license area with no endorsement. When you renew your license, you will need to meet the Utah defined NCLB standards for veteran educators to retain your highly qualified status.

NCLB endorsements (Fine Arts, World Languages, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies), any license area

Route 1:

If, according to CACTUS on August 28, 2003, during the 2002-2003 school year you:
were employed prior to Aug. 30, 2002 (including prior years) AND
were not an intern AND
held a degree major in an NCLB subject area AND
were on the state-approved endorsement program (SAEP) to earn an endorsement in the same subject area as your degree major AND

your SAEP endorsement was attached to a basic or standard license area
your SAEP endorsement(s) is qualified for the interim until your SAEP expires.
Your SAEP endorsement(s) and your interim qualification expire on your endorsement expiration date.
Until that date, you will be NCLB highly qualified for any NCLB assignment that requires a license area
that you hold and your SAEP endorsement. When you renew your license, you will need to meet the
Utah defined NCLB standards for veteran educators to retain your highly qualified status.

Routes 2 and 3:

If, according to CACTUS on August 28, 2003, during the 2002-2003 school year you:
were employed prior to Aug. 30, 2002 (including prior years) AND
were not an intern AND
held a permanent endorsement but not a degree major in that subject area AND
that endorsement was attached to a basic or standard license area
your endorsement(s) in that subject are qualified for the interim until your current license expires.

Your interim qualification expires on your license expiration date. Until that date OR until you renew
your educator license that expires on that date, you will be NCLB highly qualified for any NCLB
assignment that requires a license area that you hold and an endorsement in that subject area. When
you renew your license, you will need to meet the Utah defined NCLB standards for veteran educators to
retain your highly qualified status.

Full NCLB Highly Qualified for Veteran Educators in Elementary and Early Childhood license areas

If, according to CACTUS on August 28, 2003, during the 2002-2003 school year you:
held a level 1, 2, or 3 license AND
held a basic or standard license area in early childhood or elementary AND
had a degree major in elementary or early childhood (according to your license area) AND
had a degree major in an NCLB subject area
your elementary and/or early childhood license area(s) are NCLB highly qualified.

Full NCLB Highly Qualified for New and Veteran Educators holding NCLB endorsements (Fine Arts, World Languages, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies), any license area

If, according to CACTUS on August 28, 2003 you:
hold a basic or standard license area that expires after 7/1/2002 AND
hold a degree major in an NCLB subject AND
hold one or more permanent endorsements in that subject area
your endorsement(s) in that subject area are highly qualified.

Note that for world languages, the major must be the specific language, i.e. only a German major will
qualify one in German, and will not apply to French.

Each subject area will be distinct from the others; being highly qualified in mathematics will not
automatically make you highly qualified in language arts, unless you hold a degree major in some area of
language arts.

Please note that the aforementioned calculations will be made according to the data in CACTUS on
August 28, 2003. If the educator's data is incorrect, it may be corrected by forwarding adequate

documentation to USOE Educator Licensing, and the educator-licensing technician will adjust the NCLB qualification flags accordingly. Any educator who does not meet the above criteria and wants to be NCLB highly qualified will need to contact their school principal for manual evaluation.

NCLB Assignment Qualification

Only elementary assignments (core code 2201. . .) and NCLB subject areas (core codes 02, 03, 06, 07, 08, 09) will be considered for NCLB qualification.

1. If an educator is not USOE qualified, the educator is automatically not NCLB qualified.
2. The educator must have a level 1, 2, or 3 license with a status of new, renewed or reinstated.
3. The license areas must be basic or standard to have an NCLB qualification.
4. The endorsements must be completed SAEP to have an NCLB qualification.
5. The educator must be assigned to an active NCLB assignment.
6. Based on the USOE CACTUS assignment requirements table, the educator must hold the license area and endorsement, if required, for the assignment.
7. If the educator is assigned to grade 7 or grade 8 in a self-contained setting and is not at an elementary school, that educator is not NCLB qualified.
8. If the educator is assigned to grades 5 - 8 in a self-contained setting, only an elementary license area will be considered NCLB qualified. USOE allows middle and secondary license areas, but NCLB standards do not.
9. If an educator is qualified in multiple areas, i.e., elementary and early childhood for grade 2, or geology and earth science for geology, the highest level of qualification will be used. If the geology endorsement is highly qualified and the earth science endorsement is not NCLB or interim, the assignment will be highly qualified based on the geology endorsement.