

Utah State Board of Education (USBE)  
Intergenerational Poverty (IGP) Work Group  
Report



ADA Compliant March 2022

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

USBE IGP Work Group Mission Statement .....	3
USBE IGP Work Group Vision .....	3
USbe IGP Afterschool grant Background Information .....	3
USBE IGP afterschool Grant Information and Requirements .....	3
USBE IGP Grant Funding Options .....	4
Purpose of the USBE IGP Grant Program .....	4
Currently Funded USBE IGP Grant Programs.....	4
USBE IGP afterschool Grant Evaluation Information .....	5
USBE IGP GRANT PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	5
Department of Workforce Services (DWS) Office of Child Care (OCC) Supplemental Afterschool grant Funding.....	5
USBE IGP Work Group Responses to Deputy Superintendent Norman’s Questions .....	6
1. Gain an understanding of which schools have a highly qualified afterschool program, so we can expand the IGP program.....	6
2. Communication of IGP narrative and “pulling them up by their bootstraps” conversation ..	6
3. Connect to partners and non-profits.....	7
4. Consider the work and needs of rural schools .....	8
5. Review and use the IGP Data presented by USBE .....	8
Annual Descriptive Report for DWS .....	8
Longitudinal Reports for DWS .....	8
Afterschool Program Evaluations .....	13
6. Define how parents have a voice .....	14
7. What are we doing specifically in the area of Chronic absenteeism? .....	14
Questions for the USBE IGP work group to consider.....	15
1. What are our big initiatives? .....	15
2. What are our biggest challenges? .....	15
4. What are we doing specifically in the area of Chronic absenteeism? .....	16
5. How can we bring IGP and SES data into the conversation at more touchpoints?.....	16
6. Define What USBE’s Role is in Supporting Students and Families Affected by IGP .....	16
7. How Does USBE Build LEA Capacity? .....	17

## USBE IGP WORK GROUP MISSION STATEMENT

Define what the Utah State Board (USBE) of Education's role is in supporting students and families affected by intergenerational poverty (IGP).

## USBE IGP WORK GROUP VISION

Determine a collaborative objective of how to support students and families affected by IGP, and how to build local education agency (LEA) capacity and competency.

## USBE IGP AFTERSCHOOL GRANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In 2013, the Utah State Legislature established the Intergenerational Poverty Commission with Executive Directors from the following state agencies:

- Department of Workforce Services (DWS)
- Department of Health (DOH)
- Department of Human Services (DHH)
- Utah State Office of Education (USBE)
- Juvenile Courts (JCs)

In 2014, the Utah State Legislature passed [Senate Bill \(S.B.\) 43: Intergenerational Poverty Interventions in Public Schools](#) (sponsored by Senator Reid), which provided funding for afterschool programming. Administered through the USBE, individual grants were made available to LEAs for new or existing afterschool programs that provided targeted services for students affected by intergenerational poverty through a competitive application process.

The USBE IGP grant funding focuses on high quality afterschool programming and academics, including intentional math and reading interventions. The Department of Workforce Services (DWS) Office of Child Care (OCC) may provide supplemental funding for enrichment and prevention education activities to USBE IGP grantees serving elementary-age students. Grants are awarded through a competitive application process for a three-year grant period to support new or existing afterschool programs to provide targeted services for students impacted by intergenerational poverty. All proposed program sites must have a 10% or greater IGP rate (Utah IGP Report) or submit a written waiver with detailed information and data about programs sites with IGP rates below 10%.

## USBE IGP AFTERSCHOOL GRANT INFORMATION AND REQUIREMENTS

- The IGP grant follows a three-year grant cycle
- Total funding available for new grants for the 2020-2021 school year was \$950,000
- All proposed program sites must be at 10% or greater IGP rate (Utah IGP Report 2019 or Utah IGP Data Dashboard) \*waiver process if under 10%
- No more than five program sites could be included on one application
- Program(s) must:

- Operate a minimum of 10 hours a week and 32 weeks during the school year
- Maintain an average daily attendance (ADA) of 10 youth
- Ensure all staff working 10 hours or more in the program receive a minimum of 20 hours of professional development each school year
  - 25 hours of professional development for site coordinators/managers
- Academic Achievement
  - LEA/school will provide services to improve the academic achievement of students affected by intergenerational poverty
- Coordination with other state agencies and organizations to provide services to students and families, including:
  - DWS
  - DOH
  - DHH
  - USBE
  - JCs

## USBE IGP GRANT FUNDING OPTIONS

*Option A:* LEAs with schools that already have afterschool programs may apply for supplemental grants ranging from \$30,000 to \$50,000 per site per school year to augment the amount or intensity of services to benefit students affected by intergenerational poverty.

*Option B:* LEAs with schools that do not have existing afterschool programs may apply for funds ranging from \$100,000 - \$200,000 per site per school year to establish quality afterschool programs.

## PURPOSE OF THE USBE IGP GRANT PROGRAM

The purpose of the USBE IGP Grant program is to provide out of school education services that assist students affected by intergenerational poverty in achieving academic success in partnerships with state agencies including DWS, DOH, DHS and JCs. IGP funds can support a wide range of activities to advance student academic achievement and support student success.

## CURRENTLY FUNDED USBE IGP GRANT PROGRAMS

- American Preparatory Academy
- Cache School District
- Canyons School District
- Davis School District
- Entheos Academy
- Grand School District
- Granite School District
- Guadalupe School

- Ogden School District
- Pinnacle Canyon Academy
- Provo School District

## USBE IGP AFTERSCHOOL GRANT EVALUATION INFORMATION

The Internal USBE Program evaluator is Emily Berry.

- The Focus of the Evaluation
  - The progress of funded organizations in improving the academic achievement of children affected by intergenerational poverty
  - The funded organization’s coordination efforts with the DWS, the DOH, the DHS, and the JCs
- Parent/Guardian Permission
  - Obtain and Track
  - Accurately Report Student Data
  - Participation Data
  - Submitted via USBE MOVEit SFTP Package
  - Mid-Year Check-In Submission
  - End of Year Submission

## USBE IGP GRANT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Regularly participating refers to students attending an IGP grant funded afterschool program 30 days or more during the school year.

- Improve reading proficiency rates of regularly participating afterschool students, as measured by appropriate assessment
- Improve math proficiency rates of regularly participating afterschool students, as measured by appropriate assessment
- Improve science proficiency rates of regularly participating afterschool students, as measured by appropriate assessment

## DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE SERVICES (DWS) OFFICE OF CHILD CARE (OCC) SUPPLEMENTAL AFTERSCHOOL GRANT FUNDING

DWS OCC offers to supplement all school-age (5 - 12) programs that have been awarded funding through USBE and have been selected to receive the supplement through the USBE application. DWS OCC has an annual award amount of \$775,000.

## USBE IGP WORK GROUP RESPONSES TO DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT NORMAN'S QUESTIONS

### 1. GAIN AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHICH SCHOOLS HAVE A HIGHLY QUALIFIED AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM, SO WE CAN EXPAND THE IGP PROGRAM.

The Utah Afterschool Network (UAN) is the technical assistance provider for all of USBE's afterschool grant programs (Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers, IGP, Program Quality Enhancement Grant (PQE)). UAN's team of out of school time specialists provide support for IGP funded afterschool programs, using an Aligned Quality Improvement System.

The components of the Aligned Quality Improvement Afterschool System include:

- Research, Data, Feedback, Funding
- Technical Assistance
- Professional Development
- Staff Outcomes
- Youth Outcomes

IGP-funded afterschool programs are evaluated using the Weikart Center Program Quality Assessment (PQA). Programs that receive a score of 3.5 or higher are identified as being "highly qualified." The PQA assesses afterschool programs on four following domains:

- Safe Environment
- Supportive Environment
- Interaction
- Engagement

### 2. COMMUNICATION OF IGP NARRATIVE AND "PULLING THEM UP BY THEIR BOOTSTRAPS" CONVERSATION

Questions to consider: Do we come at it from an economic standpoint on cost savings and opportunities for the state? What is the role of government?

We need to educate stakeholders on the importance of intergenerational poverty initiatives. Based on feedback heard by Deputy Superintendent Norman, stakeholders are misinformed about intergenerational poverty.

Providing these students and families with access to resources that are necessary to sustain success, aids in this shift. For instance, it is much more cost effective to provide access to resources and education now, than it would be to continue to provide government assistance for generations to come. Furthermore, the government is made up of elected officials, thus one of their responsibilities is to be a voice for those who elected them. The government should put the basic needs of students and families at the top of their priority list.

Secondary students in Utah have access to Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, pathways, and opportunities that have proven successful in helping students to positively impact their future careers. Data shows that CTE improves social and content-based engagement among students, as well as skill development for employment. Students who take as few as three courses in a career pathway graduate from high school at a significantly higher rate than their peers.

### 3. CONNECT TO PARTNERS AND NON-PROFITS

Coordination with the state agencies listed below and USBE IGP funded organizations to provide services to students and families is a USBE IGP Grant requirement.

- DWS
- DOH
- DHH
- USBE
- JCs

Additional federal afterschool funding is available to USBE IGP Grant funded LEAs through the DWS OCC.

Utah Afterschool Network (UAN) provides technical assistance to IGP funded afterschool programs.

There are a lot of programs and assistance that can be received to help students navigate their plans for postsecondary education. Below is the list of USBE's postsecondary partners at The Utah System of Higher Education (USHE).

- Utah State University
- Weber State University
- Salt Lake Community College
- Utah Valley University
- Snow College Richfield
- Southern Utah University
- Dixie State University
- Bridgerland Technical College
- Ogden Weber Technical College
- Davis Technical College
- Mountainland Technical College
- Tooele Technical College
- Southwest Technical College
- Dixie Technical College
- Uintah Basin Technical College

#### 4. CONSIDER THE WORK AND NEEDS OF RURAL SCHOOLS

Three priority points were awarded to USBE IGP applicants if the proposed program in their application operated in a rural county.

#### 5. REVIEW AND USE THE IGP DATA PRESENTED BY USBE

Each year, the USBE has provided descriptive data to the IGP commission for the annual report and produced two years of longitudinal studies for the commission. USBE is also aware of four years of IGP in afterschool grant evaluations that should contribute a great deal to this body of work. In this summary it will note key points, some key findings, selected recommendations from all three of these sources.

##### ANNUAL DESCRIPTIVE REPORT FOR DWS

Each year, DWS provides the USBE with a list of students who are affected by IGP. The USBE Data team matches those students to our enrollment data and calculate descriptive statistics on the following:

- Demographics
- Kindergarten Enrollment
- Chronic Absence
- Mobility
- Standardized Tests
- ACT Composite Scores
- AP Pass Rates
- High School Completion Rates
- Behavioral Issues in the Classroom
- Discipline Rates and Exclusionary Disciplines
- Kindergarten Entry and Exit Profile Results

From the 2021 report, on average, students affected by IGP had higher rates of chronic absence, lower ACT scores, and higher incident and discipline rates. The report can be accessed in IGP working group folder in SharePoint. These reports are not publicly available. Rather the reports are provided to DWS and they decide what information they want to include in the [annual IGP report \(available through this link here\)](#).

##### LONGITUDINAL REPORTS FOR DWS

USBE has completed two longitudinal reports for the IGP commission.

*YEAR 1: EDUCATION PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AMONG STUDENTS AFFECTED BY INTERGENERATIONAL POVERTY*

##### Overview



The [first report \(available through this link here\)](#) examined the extent to which students affected by IGP had accessed USBE administered programs designed for students from low-income backgrounds. This study had two primary goals:

- 1) To create a comprehensive list of programs that serve low-income students and students affected by IGP, and
- 2) To determine the extent to which students affected by IGP were accessing programs and services that are designed to serve them.

The report organized the programs into three basic categories. This table summarizes the most recent year of findings:

**Table 1: IGP Program Participation Findings 2019-2020**

<b>School Year</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Program Category</b>	<b>Percent of all Participants who were Identified as IGP</b>	<b>Percent of IGP Students who Participated</b>
2019-20	Early Literacy Program	student support	7.90%	61.80%
2019-20	Optional Enhanced or Extended-day Kindergarten (OEK)	student support	10.80%	46.40%
2019-20	Title I School Wide	targeted low-income	9.60%	40.10%
2019-20	Kindergarten Supplemental Enrichment Program (KSEP)	targeted low-income	11.70%	13.40%
2019-20	McKinney-Vento	targeted low-income	16.36%	11.11%
2019-20	Effective Teachers in High Poverty Schools (ETHPS)	targeted low-income	12.30%	10.50%
2018-19	Utah Preparing Students Today for a Rewarding Tomorrow (UPSTART)	student support	2.60%	9.90%

<b>School Year</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Program Category</b>	<b>Percent of all Participants who were Identified as IGP</b>	<b>Percent of IGP Students who Participated</b>
2018-19	Career and Technical Education or CTE (participants)	general program	1.86%	8.84%
2019-20	Title I Targeted Assistance	targeted low-income	4.30%	8.60%
2018-19	IGP Afterschool Program	targeted low-income	2.00%	3.80%
2018-19	High Quality School Readiness – Expansion (HQSRE)	student support	2.60%	2.30%
2018-19	CTE (concentrators)	general program	1.75%	1.55%
2018-19	CTE (completers)	general program	1.88%	1.04%
2019-20	Neglected and Delinquent	student support	10.20%	0.11%
2018-19	Afterschool Program Quality Enhancement (PQE) Grant	targeted low-income	1.50%	NA

### Discussion and Policy Considerations

The report found that in many cases, although programs and services were available, students affected by IGP may not have been accessing them. Although challenging, recruiting efforts may be needed to overcome the relatively low participation of students affected by IGP. The need for available and high-quality program data was evident. Data needs should be carefully considered and identified at the start of any grant program. It is recommended that program specialists work with data experts to determine how data will be collected, stored, and utilized. It will be important not to overlook promising programs due to a lack of student-level participation data. Future studies should likely focus on identifying and strengthening programs that show evidence of closing the achievement gap.

Diversity of program offerings is also evident in the results of the present study. Programs ranged from typical educational services to meal programs, afterschool programs, services for students experiencing homelessness, family engagement programs, mental health programs, and programs that promote career and postsecondary preparation. For some of these programs there was limited or no data from which to describe participation of students affected by IGP. However, such diverse support systems are well-aligned with literature regarding the needs of students who experience poverty. Adequate training for educators and school staff regarding available resources would likely be important.

Finally, given the fundamental role of education in overcoming poverty and the critical importance of student achievement, it should be beneficial to invest in programs that seek to identify and address students' academic needs. Programs such as the Early Literacy program, which incorporate testing for the purpose of identifying and addressing literacy needs are likely of high value. Another example of such programs is the EARS program (now known as "At-Risk WPU Add-on" due to 2021 legislative mandate), which was intended to improve academic achievement of all students at risk of academic failure. When the goal is serving low-income students, programs that identify academic needs and address them might be thought of as foundational education programs. Along with quality program implementation, the success of such programs will depend on the extent to which students' basic needs are met.

#### *YEAR 2: THE SCHOOL DISCIPLINE EXPERIENCES OF STUDENTS AFFECTED BY INTERGENERATIONAL POVERTY*

Below is an overview and discussion and policy considerations for the second longitudinal study. This paper is not currently available for the public, because it is under peer review. However, it will eventually be posted on the USBE Data and Statistics webpage. In the meantime, the full paper is accessible via [IGP Work Group Folder](#).

#### Overview

Many prior studies have documented disparities in school discipline practices across racial, economic, linguistic, and other student characteristics. The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which students affected by intergenerational poverty (IGP) received infractions (incidents) and experienced exclusionary disciplines (suspensions and expulsions), relative to other student groups. To do so, this study examined incident and discipline rates, calculated the number of lost days of instruction per 100 students, and conducted an analysis of the disciplines received by students affected by IGP and similar peers. Results suggest that students affected by IGP have higher discipline rates than other student groups and were 1.75 times more likely to receive an exclusionary discipline than similar peers. Policy considerations include professional learning opportunities, revisiting related policies and their implementations, the importance of data quality, and the use of specific metrics for ongoing monitoring.

#### Discussion and Policy Considerations

The approach to understanding the school incident and exclusionary discipline experience of students affected by IGP was to use multiple metrics. The report considered within-group incident and discipline rates, the number of lost days per 100 students, incident-based discipline rates, disparities across student groups based on the type of infractions they received, and compared the disciplines received by students affected by IGP and similar peers. Taken together, across all metrics, the findings are clear that certain groups of students experience school incidents and disciplines differently than others. Native American students, Black students, Pacific Islander students, students affected by IGP, low-income students, and students who received special education services were especially impacted.

Offering explanations for the disparities reported above is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is worth noting that authors have not attributed the disparities to differences in student behavior (APA, 2008; Heilbrun et al., 2015; Huang, 2018), rather they have pointed to teacher bias, administrator bias, and the role of policies (APA, 2008; Losen & Martinez, 2020b; Skiba et al., 2011). Such explanations for the disparities, combined with the findings from the present study, suggest that LEAs and schools should consider investing in relevant training for teachers, administrators, and school resource offices.

In addition to professional learning opportunities, the current study reveals opportunities to consider school discipline policies. In the literature reviewed, there was near consensus that zero tolerance policies were problematic, and yet such policies persist. In a recent (2021) school safety survey administered by the USBE, 44% of school administrators indicated that their school implemented zero-tolerance policies.<sup>1</sup> Future research might consider the role of such policies in school disciplines.

Given the negative outcomes of exclusionary disciplines noted in the literature review, and the disparities in exclusionary disciplines across student groups, policy makers and administrators might consider alternative approaches to student discipline. Such approaches should include comprehensive school climate frameworks that fundamentally influence our approach to supporting students. Examples include relationship building, restorative justice, social-emotional learning, and structural interventions (e.g., positive behavioral interventions and supports) (Noltemeyer et al., 2015; Skiba & Losen, 2016).

As noted in the limitations, data quality is an ongoing challenge. It is impossible to identify and address school discipline related issues unless data are properly reported, collected, managed, and analyzed. This requires infrastructure, coordination, and clear communications to data submitters. Ultimately, these data should accurately reflect student-level experiences and school-level practices (Harper, 2020). Achieving this goal requires guidance from data collectors regarding what constitutes an incident and actionable definitions for each incident type.

---

<sup>1</sup> Survey question: "Does your school have a zero-tolerance disciplinary policy that mandates predetermined consequences (i.e., suspension or expulsion) for specified offenses regardless of situation or context?" Four hundred and sixty-three schools responded to the School Safety Survey.

It is recommended that each LEA use incident and discipline data to identify and address potential disparities such as those presented in this study. More specifically, incident and discipline rates, the number of lost days per 100 students, and incident-based discipline rates might serve as readily available metrics to begin monitoring across student groups. That said, these are not the only important metrics related to school discipline. Losen, Martinez, and Shin (2021) suggested that policy makers view chronic absenteeism as a useful indicator of “the health and welfare” of students (p. 44). Monitoring rates of chronic absence and other metrics that provide insights into school climate may also be valuable in system-level approaches to school discipline (Ayoub et al., 2019; Gage, 2016). Other metrics of interest might include drop-out rates and referrals to the juvenile justice system, among others.

#### AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Beginning with school year 2014-15, the Utah Education Policy Center (UEPC) conducted several years of comprehensive evaluations of the IGP in afterschool programs. These evaluations utilized program participation data, staff survey data, the UAN Quality Tool, and academic outcomes data provided by the USBE.

This first year of the evaluation found that the program served nearly 4,000 students (attended the program at least once), 80% of whom were receiving free or reduced lunch. Fifty-seven percent of participants received at least one intervention in English language arts or mathematics. By the third year (2016-17) of the program, counts of participation and interventions had increased slightly. These evaluation reports found positive relationships between program participation and increases in Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) scores, such that for every ten days of participation, DIBELS scores increased by one point.

The most compelling evidence from the UEPC evaluations was a robust longitudinal study that utilized three years of data in several fixed effects models. The models were causal in that they tested the effects of one to three years of program participation on academic outcomes. The report concluded that “participating in IGP [afterschool] programs had significant, positive impacts on Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE) scores (end-of-year standardized assessment). As participation increased, SAGE scores also increased. For example, for every ten days students participated in an IGP afterschool program, their SAGE scores in ELA increased by 0.3. Additionally, there was a significant, positive cumulative effect on SAGE scores in all three subject areas, such that as years of attendance increased, SAGE scores increased. On average, students’ academic gains for attending three years at least tripled the gains in SAGE scores seen for one year of attendance” (Ni, et al., 2018, p.7).

#### REFERENCE

American Psychological Association (2008). Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the School? An Evidentiary Review and Recommendations. *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852-862. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852.

Ayoub, L. H., Jensen, E., Sandwick, T., Kralstein, D., Hahn, J. W., & White, E. (2019). School

Discipline, Safety, and Climate: A Comprehensive Study in New York City. Center for Court Innovation: New York City, NY.

Losen, D. J., Martinez, P., & Shin, G.H.R. (2021). *Disabling Inequity: The Urgent Need for Race-Conscious Resource Remedies*. The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project, UCLA: Los Angeles, CA.

Ni, Y., Eddings, S. K., Shooter, W., Yan, R., & Nguyen, H., (2018). *Intergenerational Poverty Interventions in Afterschool Grant Program Evaluation: Longitudinal Analyses of Student Outcomes*. Utah Education Policy Center: Salt Lake City, UT. DOI: <https://daqy2hvnfszx3.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/04/19095012/IGP-Longitudinal-Report.pdf>

Noltemeyer, A. L., Ward, R. M., & Mcloughlin, C. (2015). Relationship Between School Suspension and Student Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *School Psychology Review*, 44(2), 224-240.

Skiba, R. J., & Losen, D. J. (2016). From Reaction to Prevention: Turning the Page on School Discipline. *American Educator*, 4- 12.

#### 6. DEFINE HOW PARENTS HAVE A VOICE

Parents are informed of the data collected and how it will be evaluated and analyzed, including the purpose and individuals with access. Parents are able to opt out of having their students' participation data collected for the evaluation of the IGP Grant Program. Parents are informed of the youth outcomes and the supports provided. Communication is in a language the parents can understand and/or read.

#### 7. WHAT ARE WE DOING SPECIFICALLY IN THE AREA OF CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM?

USBE has an existing five-year contract with Safe and Civil Schools to provide Truancy/Absenteeism training for LEAs two times a year (and maybe more when additional funding is made available).

The first training was scheduled for June 21st and June 23rd, 2021. Additional trainings will be scheduled throughout the year and for the duration of the contract. LEAs will be notified of the scheduled trainings when dates and times of the training are determined by the Prevention and Student Services Team and the Safe and Civil Schools organization representatives.

USBE utilizes the [Check & Connect](#) model to provide mentoring services to students who are Youth in Custody/Care (YIC). This is a dropout prevention model for at-risk youth. The “check” portion of the model addresses attendance and absences and then uses “connect” to work with the youth and families for appropriate interventions. The YIC team has provided training to prevention programs such as Gang Prevention as requested and is seeking some collaboration from prevention and transition services within USBE.

## QUESTIONS FOR THE USBE IGP WORK GROUP TO CONSIDER

### 1. WHAT ARE OUR BIG INITIATIVES?

- IGP Grant Program
- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- PQE Grant
- Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)
- Child Nutrition Programs (CNP)
- Work-based Learning
- Apprenticeships
- Industry Credentials
- Check & Connect
  - YIC supports foster care youth through Check & Connect mentors as many of these students fall under the Intergenerational umbrella
- Federal Programs
- [Grants for School-Based Mental Health Supports](#)
- Truancy/Absenteeism Prevention training
- Prevention Programs such as Gang Prevention and Intervention Programs, Substance Use, Bullying, Suicide, Dropout, Human Trafficking and Child Abuse Prevention
- School Readiness Grants
- Restorative Practices
- High Quality instruction (HQI) Framework
- System of Support
- USBE Strategic Plan
- Workplace Skills
- High-Quality Instruction
- Portrait of a Graduate
- Safe and Healthy Schools
- Utah Center for Continuous Improvement
- Early Learning
- School Improvement
- Social and Emotional Learning
- Parent Engagement
- Personalized, Competency Based Learning

### 2. WHAT ARE OUR BIGGEST CHALLENGES?

- We would need additional funding in order to expand the USBE IGP Grant program to additional afterschool programs
- Identification of students who are experiencing intergenerational poverty
  - This is difficult without directly identifying an individual student

- There needs to be a better process in place to identify individual students for data purposes, without singling them out and respecting their privacy
- Identifying which individual students participating in an IGP grant afterschool program are experiencing intergenerational poverty

### **3. What collaboration or connection points can we create to get to greater outcomes more quickly?**

- Raise awareness among USBE staff in different sections about IGP programs
- Continue to collaborate within our own agency (USBE) to ensure that work is not being duplicated, and to increase capacity

### **4. WHAT ARE WE DOING SPECIFICALLY IN THE AREA OF CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM?**

- Provide Truancy/Absenteeism training
- Provide Check & Connect mentoring services to YIC students
- Encourage LEAs to integrate Portrait of Graduate at the school level and create a culture of learning that include increase protective factors for student, school, and community
- Create sense of student belonging to school using such as Restorative Practices and SEL frameworks

### **5. HOW CAN WE BRING IGP AND SES DATA INTO THE CONVERSATION AT MORE TOUCHPOINTS?**

- Ensure that data, including IGP reports are made available and are easily accessible to stakeholders and the community
- Develop opportunities and mechanisms for staff to access existing data and share with staff in other sections across the agency

### **6. DEFINE WHAT USBE'S ROLE IS IN SUPPORTING STUDENTS AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY IGP**

- Collaborate with other USBE colleague's efforts to avoid duplication
- Ensure equitable services for students throughout the State
- Identify and disseminate best practices
- Analyze program participation and associated outcomes
- Provide support around academic concerns
- Culturally responsive supports that build relationships
- Use data to make decisions regarding use of IGP funds
- Ensure that students who are eligible for IGP supports/interventions are accurately identified and informed of available services
- Provide current and relevant research to LEAs
- Additionally, identifying resources that may help LEA's serve their youth
- Evaluate programs to identify the most impactful interventions
- Make campuses (buildings) welcoming to families
  - Also provide some support to help families navigate the "system"



- Provide schools with data that will support schools in tracking progress for students in SEL areas such as attendance, office referrals
  - And have this data disaggregated
- Strengthen restorative practices supporting students who have experienced trauma, which can perpetuate possible future socioeconomic challenges and/or substance abuse

#### 7. HOW DOES USBE BUILD LEA CAPACITY?

- Begin with intentional collaboration
  - Break down silos
- Understand the strengths and needs of each LEA
- Help LEAs access data they need to identify IGP statistics and trends
- Facilitate sharing of best practices
- Provide data (disaggregated) to LEAs
- Providing professional learning, technical assistance and coaching for LEAs to ensure they understand their school assessment data
- Provide Title I training related to Resource Allocation and the braiding of State and Federal funds to Title I schools