

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)):

c. English Language Proficiency. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii)) 1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Long-term goals were established based on a grade level analysis of the ~~2016~~ **2023-2024** rates for reclassifications as English proficient determined by achieving an overall proficiency level of 4.2 or greater and a 3.5 or greater in speaking ~~a 5.0 composite score~~ as measured by performance on the ~~WIDA ACCESS~~ **state approved ELP assessment**. The method of analysis used two factors to identify a trajectory toward becoming English proficient within ~~five~~ **six** years: ~~the student's age~~ **the student's time in an EL program** and the level of ELP at the time they entered Utah's education system. Based on ~~that~~ **Utah's EL empirical** data and consultation across the SEA with feedback from selected LEAs **and policy advisors**, the student grouping for monitoring growth ~~have~~ **has** been designated as ~~three~~ **one** grade bands: **of K-12**. ~~1) Grade K-3 to align with State literacy initiatives and dual language programs, 2) Grade 4-7 to support effective and innovative transitions from elementary to middle school; and 3) Grade 8-12 to focus resources on longterm ELs. Utah's refugee and immigrant student populations who often enter into Utah's schools at the secondary level, students who are ELs with disabilities as well as an effective transition to high school. These long-term goals are ambitious because the analysis to determine the trajectory ranged from 2-7 years and the decision to use five~~ **six** years as the expected timeline for ELP was set by Utah's Data and Statistics section in consultation with the individuals over federal programs at the USBE. Measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of ELs making progress in achieving ELP are provided in Appendix A. ~~The measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of ELs making progress in achieving ELP are presented in Appendix A.~~

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))

d. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Utah's accountability system includes progress in achieving **English Language Proficiency (ELP)** as an indicator across all schools in the State with at least 10 ELs consistent with the State-determined minimum n-size. Utah defines ELP as earning an overall proficiency level of 4.2 or greater and a 3.5 or greater in speaking as measured by the ~~WIDA ACCESS for EL~~ **state approved ELP** assessment, which is administered annually to all ELs in the State. This assessment measures academic language development in the domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Initial, or the baseline, ELP level and grade level at the time of entry factor into Utah's definition of making adequate progress towards ELP and moves away from the one-size-fits-all approach for determining growth targets for adequate progress. The following variables underlie Utah's model for measuring EL progress toward ELP:

- Initial ELP in the year of identification;

AND

- ~~Grade level at the time of initial enrollment and entrance into effective language instruction programs; and,~~
- Time enrolled in Utah schools, receiving supportive instruction in English language development and grade-level content.

Based on these ~~three~~ **two** variables, individual annual growth targets for determining adequate progress toward ELP are set to determine the change expected annually in each ELs composite proficiency level (comprised of speaking, listening, reading, and writing) on the annual ~~ACCESS~~ **state approved ELP** assessment (**Exhibit 7**). **All students will be placed on the Grades K-12 EL Overall Adequate Growth table initially unless the student reaches an overall proficiency of 4.2 or higher. If a student reaches the overall proficiency level of a 4.2 but does not reach the second criteria of a speaking score of 3.5 or higher to exit, then the student will have growth calculated on their speaking score (Exhibit 8). Once a student is placed on the Grades K-12 EL Speaking Adequate Growth Table, the student will not be moved back to the Grades K-12 EL Overall Adequate Growth Table. The student's growth will be determined by the Grades K-12 EL Speaking Adequate Growth Table until they reach both criteria to be considered proficient and exit EL status.**

The percentage of points for a school is determined by the number of current EL students who meet or exceed their adequate progress target OR reach proficiency divided by the total number of EL students in the school. This percentage is multiplied by the 13 points possible for this indicator to determine the number of points allocated to a school (note: EL students in their first year are excluded from the

calculation because they do not have a prior year score; their ACCESS ELP score in their first year is needed to establish baseline):

$$\text{Points} = \left(\frac{\text{Number of ELs making adequate progress} + \text{ELs reaching proficiency}}{\text{Total number of current EL students} - \text{first year ELs}} \right) \times 13$$

Exhibit 7: Initial Grade 1-3 EL Adequate Progress Targets

Initial ELP Level	Time in EL Program					
	Baseline	1	2	3	4	5
1.0-1.7	Baseline	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7
1.8-2.5	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5
2.6-3.3	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4
3.4-4.1	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2

Exhibit 8: Initial Grade 4-7 EL Adequate Progress Targets

Initial ELP Level	Time in EL Program					
	Baseline	1	2	3	4	5
1.0-1.7	Baseline	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7
1.8-2.5	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6
2.6-3.3	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3
3.4-4.1	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2

Exhibit 9: Initial Grade 8-12 EL Adequate Progress Targets

Initial ELP Level	Time in EL Program					
	Baseline	1	2	3	4	5
1.0-1.7	Baseline	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	
1.8-2.5	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.4	
2.6-3.3	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	
3.4-4.1	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	

*Gray cells indicate years after the student should have met exit criteria.

Exhibit 7: Grades K-12 EL Overall Adequate Progress Targets

	Time (Years) in EL Program					
Baseline ELP Level	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.0 to 1.9	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1
2.0 to 2.9	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1
3.0 to 4.1	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1

Exhibit 8: Grades K-12 EL Speaking Adequate Growth Progress Targets (Speaking Target 3.5)

	Time (Years) since reaching Overall Composite of 4.2 or higher in EL Program		
Baseline ELP Level	1	2	3+
Current Speaking score once 4.2 Overall proficiency attained	0.3	0.2	0.1

For EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate annual ELP, Utah defines ELP through one of two pathways:

- Exit by earning an overall proficiency of 5

OR

- May exit, at the discretion of the LEA, in consultation with the IEP team (which must include the LEA/School ELL person), by earning an overall proficiency of 4 and an overall proficiency of a 4 on the English Language Arts alternate state content summative assessment.

Individual annual growth targets for determining alternate adequate progress toward ELP are set to determine the change expected annually in each ELs composite scale score level (comprised of speaking, listening, reading, and writing) on the annual state approved alternate ELP assessment (Exhibit 9).

Students taking the state approved alternate annual ELP assessment will be considered making adequate progress if they meet the uniform growth target of 3 scale score points each year.

Exhibit 9: Grade K-12 Alternate Uniform Growth Progress Target

Growth Target for Alternative ELP assessment
3 scale score points per year

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

vi. Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))

a. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

For Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) – Low Performance, ~~Utah will identify, for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI),~~ **Utah identifies** any Title I school that performed in the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools according to the school's performance on the indicators in the State's accountability system for three school years, on average. The USBE made these identifications beginning in the 2018-19 school year and ~~is continuing~~ **is continuing** to identify once every three years thereafter.

b. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

For CSI – Low Graduation Rate, ~~Utah identifies any~~ **Utah identifies** ~~Utah will identify public high schools for CSI by identifying any public high school~~ with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of less than or equal to ~~67~~ **66.67** percent for three school years, on average. Utah identified schools for this category beginning in the 2018-19 school year and ~~is continuing~~ **is continuing** to identify once every three years thereafter.

c. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional Comp support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State- determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

For CSI – Low Performing Student Groups, ~~Utah identifies any Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Title I schools~~ **Utah identifies any Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Title I schools** ~~Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (i.e., schools that are identified as having low performing student groups)~~ that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria described in section A.4.viii.b within **three or** four years. **The USBE identifies such schools no more than annually, to align with ATSI exit requirements, beginning in the school year 2024–2025, based on prior school year data.** ~~will be identified for CSI for low~~

~~performance. The USBE will identify such schools annually beginning in the school year 2024-2025 based on prior school year data. This revision is based on the approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) COVID-19 State Plan Addendum for Utah in 2021-2022.~~

d. **Frequency of Identification.** Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

See Exhibit 15 for timeline and frequency with which schools will be identified for CSI.

~~Exhibit 15: Identifying CSI Schools Timeline~~

Types of Schools	Description	Frequency of Identification	Initial year of identification
CSI - Low Performance Lowest Performing (Title I Schools)	Any Title I school performing in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools for three years, on Average-	Once every three years	2018-2019
CSI - Low Graduation Rate Low High School Graduation Rate	Any high school in the State with a 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate at or below 66.67 percent for three years, on average-	Once every three years	2018-2019
CSI - Low Performing Student Groups Consistently Low-Performing Student Group	Any Title I school with a consistently underperforming student group that does not improve within three or four years-	Annually in alignment with ATSI exit	2024-2025

~~Timeline for identification and Implementation of CSI Schools~~

~~September-October 2018~~

- Lowest performing schools were identified.
- Notifications to local education agencies (LEA).
- The USBE held meetings with LEAs and schools to discuss school improvement process and requirements.
- LEAs and schools notified parents regarding the school's improvement status.

November 2018-March 2019

- Comprehensive needs assessment and root cause analysis were completed for each school.
- Needs assessment and root cause analyses were used to develop a school improvement plan with input from all stakeholder groups that includes evidence-based interventions.

April-May 2019

- LEAs submitted school improvement plans to the USBE.
- The USBE convened a cross-section team to review and approve plans and provide specific feedback to LEAs.

May-August 2019

- LEAs and schools planned and prepared for implementation.

August 2019-June 2021

- Schools implemented improvement plans.
- The USBE and external consultants engaged with schools in quarterly progress checks and provided technical assistance.

If a school is identified for more than one CSI designation, the USBE provides support and funding for all CSI designations, and the school will need to meet all exit criteria for each designation. Schools already identified for CSI will not be double identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), ATSI, Elevate, or Springboard.

e. Targeted Support and Improvement. Describe the State's methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))

For **TSI**, Utah identifies any school with a "consistently underperforming" student group if, for two consecutive years, any of its student groups falls below the percentage of points (cut score) associated with the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in the State's accountability system. Student groups include economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, students who are English learners, and students by major racial and ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian or Alaska Native,

Black or African American, White, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Hispanic or Latino, and Multi-race). Schools identified must have a total N size of 10 students who took a reportable test and were enrolled for the full academic year in each student group each year to be considered for TSI identification.

~~USBE's Strategic Plan includes a commitment to ensuring equitable educational opportunities for each student. Identifying schools with one or more consistently underperforming student groups will encourage the State, LEAs, and schools to focus more attention on underperforming student groups and will help the State meet its education goals for each student.~~

~~A school is identified as having a "consistently underperforming" student group if, for two consecutive years, any of its student groups falls below the percentage of points (cut score) associated with the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools in the State's accountability system. Student groups include economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, students who are ELs, and students by major racial and ethnic groups (i.e., American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, White, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Asian, Hispanic or Latino, and Multiracial students). Schools identified must have a total N size of 10 enrolled students each year being considered for targeted support and improvement (TSI) identification. This identification occurs annually beginning in the 2018-2019 school year (except for approved exceptions resulting from COVID-19 disruptions). Schools already identified for CSI will not be identified for TSI.~~

f. Additional Targeted Support. Describe the State's methodology, for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

For **ATSI**, Utah identifies any school with a student group whose 3-year average performance is below the cut score used to identify CSI schools. ~~ATSI Schools will be identified if a student group's 3-year average performance is below the 5% of the highest performing CSI bottom 5% cut of Title I schools which is also calculated once every three years. The schools identified for ATSI will be~~ **are** identified once every three years following the same cycle of identification as CSI. Schools identified must have a total N size of 10 in each year of the accountability indicator of the years used in the three-year average, and they must be currently identified as a TSI school.

g. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

The USBE has two additional state designations, Elevate and Springboard. The USBE invites schools that are non-Title I and who are implementing TSI and/or ATSI activities to apply to be designated as an

Elevate school. Elevate schools receive technical assistance and funding to address the needs of the TSI and/or ATSI student groups. Elevate schools are selected every year except in the year Springboard schools are designated.

~~The USBE has two additional designations of statewide categories of schools, Elevate and Springboard. The USBE beginning in the 2022-2023 school year, will invite schools that are not Title I and who are implementing TSI and/or ATSI activities under 20 U.S.C. Sec. 6311; to apply to be designated as an Elevate school and receive dedicated support including, but not limited to: a needs assessment, root cause analysis, resources, and support to address needs to improve the school's previous performance of TSI and/or ATSI student groups. Elevate schools will be selected every year that the USBE does not designate a Springboard school. Any of the non-Title I schools that are identified as Elevate or Springboard schools will be held to the same ESEA requirements outlined for TSI and ATSI schools. This includes Resource Allocation Reviews (RAR), improvement plans, and any additional support activities and progress monitoring required for TSI and/or ATSI schools, respectively.~~

Beginning in the 2025-2026 school year, ~~the~~ USBE will designate a school as a Springboard school based on school accountability results from the same school year **seven schools as Springboard schools**. A Springboard school is ~~not a~~ **non-**Title I school that, ~~and when ranked according to the percentage of possible points averaged over three school years is: one of the five lowest performing elementary, middle, or junior high schools statewide; or one of the two lowest performing high schools statewide for a total of seven schools.~~ **Springboard schools receive technical assistance and funding to address needs to improve the school's performance.** Springboard schools will be designated every four years.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

- vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)): Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

In accordance with State law, Utah factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide assessments into the accountability system by publishing the school's participation rate on a school's report card (~~Utah State Code U.C.A.~~ section 53E-5-211). The participation rate calculated for reporting purposes ~~will include~~s students who do not participate in an assessment due to parent opt-out provisions prescribed in State law (~~Utah State Code UCA~~ section 53G-6-803).

Utah law authorizes a parent to excuse a student from taking a statewide assessment (~~Utah State Code U.C.A.~~ § 53G-6-803). ~~State law conflicts with the 95% achievement indicator calculation requirement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii)). Complying with this requirement means that accountability scores calculated for Federal accountability will differ from accountability scores calculated for State accountability, essentially bifurcating our accountability system for reporting purposes and school improvement identification. Specifically, Utah calculates the achievement indicator in accordance with ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii), effectively counting non-tested students more than five percent as non-proficient. The achievement indicator is one indicator within the accountability system that accounts for 25% of a high school's overall accountability score and 37% of an elementary or middle school's overall accountability score. Compliance with this provision of State law makes it impossible for the USBE to ensure compliance with the 95 percent requirement. However, as required by ESSA, the achievement indicator calculations for Federal accountability will differ from the State calculations. Specifically, Utah will calculate the achievement indicator in accordance with ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii), effectively counting non-tested students in excess of five percent as non-proficient for purposes of accountability and identification of schools for support and improvement under ESSA. The achievement indicator is one indicator within accountability system that accounts for 25% of a high school's overall accountability score and 37% of an elementary or middle school's overall accountability score.~~

~~Because State law conflicts with the 95% achievement indicator calculation requirement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii)), complying with this requirement means that accountability scores calculated for Federal accountability will differ from accountability scores calculated for State accountability, essentially bifurcating our accountability system for reporting purposes and school improvement identification.~~

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))

- a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

To exit **CSI - Low Performance (Academic Growth) designation**, the school shall demonstrate, in the third or fourth year after which the school was identified as a CSI school, that the school **will**:

1. meets individualized exit criteria ~~that is calculated~~ by reducing the gap by one-third in performance between the school's baseline performance and 55% of all points possible, (if the school is an elementary, middle school, or junior high school), and 57% of all points possible, (if the school is a high school), using the accountability indicators ~~found in the Utah ESSA State Plan~~.

AND

2. exceeds the **cut score of the** lowest 5% of Title I Schools from the year they were identified.

To exit **CSI - Low Graduation Rate Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Low Graduation (Graduation Growth) designation**, the school ~~will be required to~~ **must** have a graduation rate above **66.67** percent in either their third or fourth year of designation.

To exit **CSI - Low Performing Student Groups Comprehensive Support and Improvement Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (CSI ATSI) (Targeted CSI) designation**, the school shall ~~demonstrate~~, in the third or fourth year after which the school was identified as a CSI school, that the school **will**:

1. meets individualized exit criteria ~~that is calculated~~ by reducing the gap for all designated **ATSI** student groups by one-third in performance between the student group(s) baseline performance and 55% of all points possible, (if the school is an elementary, middle school, or junior high school), and 57% of all points possible, (if the school is a high school), using the accountability indicators ~~found in the Utah ESSA State Plan~~. The baseline and targets for each designated **ATSI** group ~~is to be~~ **are** reset upon identification as **CSI - Low Performing Student Groups Targeted CSI**.

AND

2. ~~each designated targeted student group~~ exceeds the **cut score of the** lowest 5% of Title I Schools from the year they were identified **for each designated student group**.

b. Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

To exit **Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)** designation, the school shall ~~demonstrate~~, in the third or fourth year after which the school was identified ~~as an ATSI school, that~~, the school will, for each designated student group:

1. meets individualized exit criteria ~~that is calculated~~ by reducing the gap by one-third in performance between the ATSI Student Group ~~student group~~ baseline performance and 55% of all points possible, (if the school is an elementary, middle school, or junior high school), and 57% of all points possible, (if the school is a high school), using the accountability indicators found in the Utah ESSA State Plan.

AND

2. exceeds the ~~cut score of the~~ lowest 5% of Title I Schools from the year they were identified for each designated student group.

Any Title I school that does not meet the exit criteria will be identified for CSI – Low Performing Student Groups.

~~Schools are expected to make the necessary improvements to exit within four years. This timeline for exiting ATSI status is intended to allow schools at least two years to implement changes in practice and two years to demonstrate improvement. Any Title I school that does not meet the exit criteria will be identified for CSI. Any Title I ATSI school that has a student group's 3-year average performance at or below the 5% cut of Title I schools when ranked will be designated as a CSI ATSI (Targeted CSI) school.~~

~~Schools are expected to make the necessary improvements to exit within four years. This timeline for exiting ATSI status is intended to allow schools at least two years to implement changes in practice and two years to demonstrate improvement. Any Title I school that does not meet the exit criteria will be identified for CSI.~~

c. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

~~Utah will employ a diverse set of school improvement strategies in schools that do not meet exit criteria described in section A.4.viii.a. State law requires the USBE to establish implications for schools designated for State school improvement that do not meet exit criteria (UCA 53E-5-306). As described in~~

section 4.vi.g of this document, moving forward, the State will have one accountability and school improvement system to avoid confusion in overlapping, often conflicting requirements and initiatives. Therefore, USBE will align exit criteria and implications for not meeting exit criteria for both programs. If a school designated as CSI for improvement does not meet exit criteria requirements, State law authorizes the USBE to intervene by choosing the most appropriate intervention based on data:

- Adjust the currently approved strategies and plan
- Implement state-determined strategies and plan
- Restructuring Restructure a district school, which may include contract management, conversion to a charter school, close the school, or State state takeover;
- Restructuring Restructure a charter school by terminating a school's charter, closing the school, or transferring operation and control of the charter school; or
- Other appropriate action as determined by the USBE (UCA 53E-5-306).

The USBE has adopted Rules establishing implications and more rigorous interventions for schools that do not meet the exit criteria (R277-920). The USBE will prescribe more rigorous interventions for such schools based on recommendations from a State review panel, composed of experts in various fields, and the local school board, with input from the community. The State review panel is required to evaluate the root causes of the school's persistent underperformance and recommend a strategy for improvement based on the specific needs of the school.

d. Resource Allocation Review. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

To support LEAs and schools in achieving excellence for each student, USBE staff will conduct a systematic and collaborative resource allocation review for all newly identified CSI schools. Additionally, any LEA that serves significant numbers or percentages of student groups that are identified for improvement will be required to participate in a resource allocation review. Because LEA size varies considerably across the State, the definition of "significant numbers or percentages of student groups" will be set at 20%. This means that any LEA that has 20% or more of their existing student groups identified for targeted improvement will be identified for a resource allocation review.

Utah law requires the USBE to study the feasibility of reporting school-level expenditures on the USBE website. Accordingly, the USBE has developed a school-level expenditures report that will be used to review resource allocation in support of school improvement. The school-level expenditures report includes school-level information on per-pupil expenditures, a breakdown of expenditures by category (e.g., instruction, administration, transportation) and average staff salaries.

The USBE conducts a systematic and collaborative Resource Allocation Review (RAR) every three years with 15 LEAs that serve significant numbers or percentages of schools identified for improvement.

To inform the RARs, the USBE developed a school-level expenditures report that can be used in support of school improvement. The school-level expenditures report includes school-level information on per-pupil expenditures, a breakdown of expenditures by category (e.g., instruction, administration, transportation) and average staff salaries.

~~Resources Allocation Reviews~~ RARs will ~~are~~ not be limited to only the amount of financial support the LEA provides to schools in improvement status. ~~The~~ USBE will ~~also be looking~~ at additional resources such as human resources, instructional time, ~~and programs~~, and materials. ~~As described in the following section A.4.viii.e of this document, USBE will also conduct an LEA-level comprehensive needs assessment for LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for CSI or TSI.~~

e. Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

The USBE differentiates support and technical assistance provided to LEAs based on the results of the needs assessment LEAs complete to receive funding, the number of schools identified for improvement, the quality of Support and Improvement Plans, and progress monitoring data. LEAs receive additional technical assistance from experts across various USBE sections, based on the outcomes of the needs assessment.

~~The USBE will provide the tool for a comprehensive needs assessment at the LEA level for all LEAs including LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for CSI. The needs assessment is organized around the Four Domains of Rapid School Improvement and includes qualitative and quantitative LEA level data, a root cause analysis protocol, and a summary where the LEA leadership team develops key goals in response to the identified needs. The USBE will differentiate support and technical assistance provided to LEAs based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment, which will include an LEA's capacity to implement and sustain change, commitment to improvement efforts, and whether the LEA has a clear and compelling vision and strategy for prioritizing the levels of local support for schools in improvement status.~~

~~The LEA-level comprehensive needs assessment will include:~~

- ~~• Dynamic and centralized visualization tools for State collected student achievement and growth data;~~
- ~~• Qualitative and quantitative data related to leadership, talent, instruction, and culture/engagement;~~
- ~~• Priority for teacher recruitment and retention, hiring, and staffing;~~
- ~~•~~

- ~~Flexibility in determining school schedules, including the provision of extended school days and/or school year;~~
- ~~Flexibility to determine professional learning opportunities for teachers and staff that are directly related to identified school-specific needs;~~
- ~~Flexibility in budgeting at the school level to meet students' needs as identified by a school-level comprehensive needs assessment and root cause analysis;~~
- ~~Opportunity for coaching teachers and leaders; and~~
- ~~Opportunity for more consistent and frequent onsite support from LEA-level content specialists and administrators; and~~
- ~~Enhanced capability to see how funding from various Federal and State sources can be used to support the identified goals.~~

~~Additionally, the USBE provides various supports to all LEAs with any number of schools identified for CSI or TSI. The USBE provides professional learning opportunities for LEA leaders on data-driven instruction, leadership, instructional coaching, co-teaching, core content, and evidence-based meaningful parent engagement strategies. Also, LEAs and schools will be provided technical assistance in the selection of evidence-based practices that meet specific needs identified through the comprehensive needs assessment and root cause analysis during the development of required school improvement plans.~~

~~The USBE Center for Continuous School Improvement has been created within the USBE to align State school improvement efforts, and one of their tasks is to gather information and vet resources on evidence-based practices for inclusion in an online repository that all LEAs and schools can readily access during the school improvement planning and implementation process.~~

f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

The USBE conducts differentiated monitoring activities with and provides technical assistance to LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified for CSI and not meeting exit criteria.

Not Applicable.

E. Title III, Part A, Subpart I: English Language Acquisition and Enhancement

1. Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2)): Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

Entrance Procedures

Students, new to Utah or returning to Utah after leaving, must be identified, and assessed for services within 30 days of the first day of school. Students returning to a Utah school, within the same school year, do not need to be screened if they have a Utah administrated ~~WIDA~~ **English Language Proficiency (ELP) Screener** or ~~WIDA-ACCESS~~ **annual ELP assessment** score from the same school year. Those students who enroll after the first month at the beginning of the school year must be assessed during the first 10 school days of enrollment. Parent(s) or guardians must be notified of placement in a language instruction education program within the 30-day window at the beginning of the year or the 10-day window thereafter, whichever applies for identification. LEAs shall keep record of all EL documentation to verify the correct process is in place. ~~Page 78~~ The standardized Utah Home Language Survey (HLS) is translated into ~~six~~ **11** languages commonly spoken in Utah for the enrollment process. It is the responsibility of the LEA to provide a translated HLS if needed in any other languages.

At the time a student first enrolls, Utah uses a standard HLS¹⁶ that identifies a student with a native language other than English, or who comes from an environment where a non-English language either is dominant or may have affected a student's ELP. Required questions to target the most relevant information include the following:

- What is the primary language used in the home, regardless of the language spoken by the student?
- What is the language most often spoken by the student?
- What is the language that the student first acquired?
- What language do you prefer for school-to-home information?
- Does your family come from a refugee background?

The purpose of the HLS is to identify those students who may be potentially designated as ELs. Potential EL students, as determined by the HLS, must be assessed in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing through the State-adopted ELP **screeners** assessment ~~currently WIDA Screener~~. The ~~WIDA~~ **Screener** for Kindergarten students assesses only the domains of speaking and listening during the first semester of the school year. Kindergarten students who enroll during the second semester of the school year must be assessed in all four domains. The result of the assessment determines if, ~~in fact,~~ the student is an EL and in need of specialized language and academic support services to which they are entitled. To ensure that students are not wrongly identified as potential ELs, technical assistance is provided by the USBE. Including refugee background and preferred home-to-school communication in the HLS helps LEAs determine appropriate services for EL and refugee families, but it does not trigger language screener administration.

Technical assistance to LEAs is provided by the USBE through an annual August webinar to ensure the purpose of the HLS is clearly understood by those who will administer it and those who will complete it. This survey cannot be used to confirm citizenship status or predetermine educational services. Consequently, to obtain accurate information, LEAs shall inform parents and families that the information provided by them will not be used to determine legal status or for any immigration purpose.

The standardized Utah HLS is translated into ~~six~~ **11** languages commonly spoken in Utah for the enrollment process. It is the responsibility of the LEA to provide a translated HLS if needed in any other languages.

Classify (Confirm/Disconfirm) a Student as an EL

Utah ~~is a member of WIDA Consortium and as a member~~ uses the initial ELP screener (~~WIDA Screener~~) to confirm EL Status (students who score a composite of ELP level 1–4.9). Those who receive a composite score between 5.0 and 6.0 on **an ELP** ~~the WIDA~~ screener do not qualify for English language services.

Individuals who administer the ~~WIDA~~ **ELP** screener receive training on administering and scoring the screener/assessment. The composite score of level 5.0 is used for kindergarten through twelfth grade to determine fluency.

Parents shall be notified annually by LEAs of a student's ELP status within 30 calendar days of the first day of school or within 10 school days after enrollment for students who are identified after the first month of school through a standard letter, adhering to the Federal Title III requirements, provided in the preferred language requested by the parent(s)/guardian(s) for school communication. Examples are provided in multiple languages by the USBE on the Utah Title III website. Through this letter, parents are informed that even if their child qualifies for EL services, they have the right to decline such services. However, the school is still responsible to ensure that students learn English in every educational setting, which includes after school, summer school, or other opportunities for evidence-based interventions, which are discussed with ALS directors at quarterly meetings and in monthly webinars.

Exit Procedures

In Utah, reclassification, or exit criteria, **for students taking the regular annual ELP assessment** is based on the following two criteria: 1) ELs receive a minimum overall composite score of 4.2 and 2) a minimum score of 3.5 in the speaking domain on the annual **ELP** ~~WIDA ACCESS for ELs~~ assessment. The LEA must notify parent(s) and/or guardian(s) of student scores within three weeks of receiving initial **ELP assessment** ~~WIDA ACCESS~~ results, in accordance with the Utah Testing Ethics Policy. LEAs shall notify the parent(s) and/or guardian(s) through the standard parent notification letter that the individual student has been exited from EL status and active language instruction services and will be monitored for a period of four years. The LEA shall initiate a teacher-student-parent conference, within 30 days of the LEA receiving the initial **ELP** ~~WIDA ACCESS for ELs~~ scores, to discuss the necessary support for the student's ability to make continuous progress.

In Utah, reclassification, or exit criteria, for EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate annual ELP assessment has two pathways. The primary pathway, in which students

taking the annual alternate ELP assessment will automatically exit, is an overall composite score of 5. The secondary pathway, which will require the decision to be made by an IEP team that includes the school or LEA EL specialist, is an overall composite score of a 4 on the annual alternate ELP and an overall 4 on the English Language Arts alternate state content summative assessment. The USBE provides guidance to LEA teams in how to determine if the secondary pathway to exit from EL services is appropriate for EL students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the annual alternate ELP assessment. The LEA must notify parent(s) and/or guardian(s) of student scores within three weeks of receiving initial alternate ELP assessment results, in accordance with the Utah Testing Ethics Policy. LEAs shall notify the parent(s) and/or guardian(s) through the standard parent notification letter that the individual student has been exited from EL status and active language instruction services and will be monitored for a period of four years. The LEA shall initiate a teacher-student-parent conference, within 30 days of the LEA receiving the initial alternate ELP scores, to discuss the necessary support for the student's ability to make continuous progress.

Monitoring of Reclassified EL/Exited

After the ~~regular and alternate~~ annual ~~ELP~~ ~~WIDA-ACCESS for ELs~~ assessment, students who meet the exit criteria enter a four-year period of monitoring. ~~Reclassification as ELP is based on performance on the WIDA-ACCESS for ELs assessment and is not based on reaching proficiency on the academic end-of-level State assessment.~~

Monitoring ensures that former EL students are making appropriate progress with respect to acquiring English and content knowledge while in the ~~regular~~ **academic** educational setting.¹⁷

LEAs that serve EL students are required to establish policies and procedures to ensure that former ELs in monitoring status are provided access to equal educational opportunities offered to peers and have access to grade level content. If a former EL student in monitoring status is not progressing academically as expected and monitoring suggests a persistent language need, LEAs may re-test the student using the **state approved ELP** ~~WIDA-Ss~~ screener to see if the student must be offered additional language assistance services. In no case should re-testing of an exited, former EL student be prohibited. If the student is reentered into EL services, however, the LEA should document the reasons why and the parent's consent to active EL language services.¹⁸

Appendix A**C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency****Exhibit 30: English Language Proficiency—Percentage of ELs Reaching Proficiency**

Student Group	Baseline 2016	Interim Goal 2017	Interim Goal 2018	Interim Goal 2019	Interim Goal 2020	Interim Goal 2021	Long- Term Goal 2024
K-3	26.5	29.3	32.0	37.5	46.9	56.3	75.0
4-7	16.1	17.7	19.3	22.5	28.1	33.8	45.0
8-12	5.7	6.2	6.6	7.5	9.4	11.3	15.0

Student Group	Baseline 2024	Interim Goal 2025	Interim Goal 2026	Interim Goal 2027	Interim Goal 2028	Interim Goal 2029	Interim Goal 2030
K-12	19.9%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%