The Global Challenge
Education in a Competitive World

A Special Supplement to Education Week’s QUALITY COUNTS 2012
About this Report

The 16th annual edition of Education Week’s Quality Counts continues the report’s tradition of tracking key education indicators and grading the states on their policy efforts and outcomes. This year’s special theme—American schooling from an international perspective—examines the nation’s place among the world’s public education systems and provides a fresh look at the political, social, and cultural challenges the United States faces in preparing its students for the workforce demands of an interconnected world economy.

The special theme is complemented by newly updated 50-state information on policies and conditions in five of the areas monitored by the report on an ongoing basis as part of Quality Counts’ State of the States framework: Chance for Success; K-12 achievement; standards, assessments, and accountability; the teaching profession; and school finance. Most of the indicators that appear in the report are based on original analyses and state-survey data from the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, supplemented by information published by other organizations.

To provide a comprehensive perspective on state policy and performance, the 2012 State Highlights Reports integrate findings from the 2011 and 2012 editions of Quality Counts. This approach allows us to capture state standings across the full set of six topical areas that comprise the report’s state-grading rubric. The overall state scores and letter grades awarded in Quality Counts are based on the following categories: Chance for Success; K-12 achievement; standards, assessments, and accountability; the teaching profession; school finance; and transitions and alignment. This year’s state reports also highlight challenges posed by a difficult economic climate, as states continue to make cuts to policies and programs in attempt to balance their budgets.

Overall findings from Quality Counts show that some states perform consistently well or poorly across the full range of graded categories. However, a closer examination of the results reveals that most states post a strong showing in at least one area. This suggests that while broad evaluations of state rankings and performance can be useful, a deeper reading of the results presented in this State Highlights Report will provide a more nuanced perspective on the educational condition of the nation and the states.
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About Editorial Projects in Education

Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization based in Bethesda, Md. Its primary mission is to help raise the level of awareness and understanding among professionals and the public of important issues in American education. EPE covers local, state, national, and international news and issues from preschool through the 12th grade. Editorial Projects in Education publishes Education Week, America’s newspaper of record for precollegiate education, Digital Directions, the Teacher Professional Development Sourcebook, and the Top School Jobs employment resource. It also produces periodic special reports on issues ranging from technology to textbooks, as well as books of special interest to educators.

The EPE Research Center conducts annual policy surveys, collects data, and performs analyses that appear in the Quality Counts, Technology Counts, and Diplomas Count annual reports. The center also produces independent research reports, contributes original data and analysis to special coverage in Education Week, and maintains the Education Counts and EdWeek Maps online data resources.
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# Utah – State Highlight 2012

## OVERALL GRADE

A state’s overall grade is the average of the scores for the six graded categories.

**Utah: C-**  
Rank: 42  
Nation: C  

**Online extra**  
Calculate your own Quality Counts grades at [www.edweek.org/go/qc12calculate](http://www.edweek.org/go/qc12calculate)

## Quality Counts Grading Breakdown

This table reports the detailed scoring behind the grades for the six major topics examined in *Quality Counts*. Scores for those major categories are based on the respective subcategory scores.

### Chance for success (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early foundations</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School years</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult outcomes</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### K-12 achievement (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standards, assessments, and accountability (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School accountability</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The teaching profession (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for quality</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives &amp; allocation</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; supporting capacity</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School finance analysis (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transitions and alignment (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early-childhood education</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College readiness</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy &amp; workforce</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States Seek International Insight

As educators and policymakers seek to prepare students for a competitive global economy, states have looked to other nations to inform the development or revision of their own academic-content standards. States are more likely to seek international guidance in mathematics and science, subjects often linked to economic competitiveness and technological innovation, than in English/language arts or social studies.

### International Standards

The national summary column indicates the number of states using international standards as a model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards from other nations used as model</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English/language arts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies/history</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finding Models For State Standards

In response to a survey from the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 23 states indicated that they used standards from other nations to inform their own standards in mathematics and/or science. State education agency staff most frequently cited standards from Singapore as a model for current state standards in those subjects.

![Bar chart showing the number of times standards from different countries were cited as models in mathematics and/or science.](chart.png)

**SOURCE:** EPE Research Center, 2012
Looking Beyond Our Borders

The Editorial Projects in Education Research Center asked state education agency officials whether they look to other countries to inform their own reform efforts. SEA officials in 29 states indicated that their agencies use such international information. In 21 states and the District of Columbia, respondents said the SEA is not currently using education data from other nations as a policy resource.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2012

Putting Global Comparisons to Use

In response to an EPE Research Center survey, many states cited a need to align student preparation with the demands of a global economy and learn from "best practices" in high-achieving nations. In describing their ways of using such insight from abroad, states most frequently noted the role of international indicators in comparing student achievement and developing academic-content standards.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2012
Cutting Back on Ways to Measure Student Performance

The EPE Research Center regularly tracks the types of test items used to measure student performance on state assessments. This year we find a notable drop in the number of states using items that are not multiple choice.

Fewer states include essay questions and other extended-response items on their assessments in 2012 than in 2010. The number of states assessing students' knowledge using short-answer questions also declined during that span. Some states point to budget cuts as a consideration when changing the format of their assessments.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2012

Reducing State-Funded Programs for Educators

The EPE Research Center tracks 10 indicators highlighting state efforts to finance programs intended to develop and allocate teaching talent. State strategies include financing professional development for teachers, encouraging teachers and principals to work in hard-to-staff schools or assignment areas, and rewarding teachers based on their performance.

Almost half the states finance fewer such programs in 2012 than they did in 2010. Many states cite budget cuts, prompted by the faltering economy, as a factor in eliminating program funding.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2012
The Chance-for-Success Index

The EPE Research Center developed the Chance-for-Success Index to better understand the role of education over an individual’s lifetime. Based on an original state-by-state analysis, this index combines information from 13 indicators that span an individual’s life from cradle to career. The Chance-for-Success framework allows states to identify strong and weak links in their residents’ educational life course—their typical trajectory from childhood through adulthood. More importantly, the index also provides information that could be used to target the efforts of public education systems in ways that better serve students of all ages.

### State Success Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Foundations</th>
<th>Utah State Average</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children from families with incomes at least 200% of poverty level (2010)</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with at least one parent with a postsecondary degree (2010)</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with at least one parent working full time and year-round (2010)</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children whose parents are fluent English-speakers (2010)</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| School Years                           |                    |                  |
| Preschool enrollment                   | 40.8               | 48.3             |
| Three- and 4-year-olds enrolled in preschool (2010) |               |                  |
| Kindergarten enrollment                | 77.9               | 77.6             |
| Eligible children enrolled in kindergarten programs (2010) |               |                  |
| Elementary reading                     | 33.5               | 32.4             |
| Fourth grade public school students proficient on NAEP (2011) |               |                  |
| Middle school mathematics              | 34.9               | 33.5             |
| Eighth grade public school students proficient on NAEP (2011) |               |                  |
| High school graduation                 | 71.9               | 71.7             |
| Public high school students who graduate with a diploma (class of 2008) |               |                  |
| Postsecondary participation            | 52.5               | 54.9             |
| Young adults enrolled in postsecondary education or with a degree (2010) |               |                  |

| Adult Outcomes                         |                    |                  |
| Adult educational attainment           | 39.8               | 38.4             |
| Adults with a two- or four-year postsecondary degree (2010) |               |                  |
| Annual income                          | 50.4               | 50.9             |
| Adults with incomes at or above national median (2010) |               |                  |
| Steady employment                      | 67.5               | 68.0             |
| Adults in labor force working full time and year-round (2010) |               |                  |

GRADE: C+ 24 C+
The *Chance-for-Success Index* captures the importance of education in a person’s lifetime from cradle to career. Its 13 individual indicators span a variety of factors, including preparation in early childhood, the performance of the public schools, and educational and economic outcomes in adulthood.

The states are graded using a “best in class” rubric, where a score of 100 points on the index would mean that a state ranked first in the nation on each and every indicator.

State scores range from 93.1 (Massachusetts, earning the only A) to 64.6 (Nevada, with a D). A closer examination of results shows that, while early foundations and adult outcomes do contribute to the index, indicators related to formal education (the schooling years) are the driving force behind the state rankings.

**NOTE:** State subscores may not sum to total score due to rounding.

**SOURCE:** EPE Research Center, 2012
The K-12 Achievement Index

The K-12 Achievement Index examines 18 distinct state achievement measures related to reading and math performance, high school graduation rates, and the results of Advanced Placement exams. The index assigns equal weight to current levels of performance and changes over time. It also places an emphasis on equity, by examining both poverty-based achievement gaps and progress in closing those gaps.

### State Achievement Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2012</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade math – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade math – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade reading – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade reading – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Gains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade math – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+7.8</td>
<td>+6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade math – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+2.7</td>
<td>+6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade reading – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade reading – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Gap</strong> (National School Lunch Program, noneligible minus eligible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading gap – 4th grade NAEP scale score (2011)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math gap – 8th grade NAEP scale score (2011)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-gap change – 4th grade NAEP (2003-2011), negative value = closing gap</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math-gap change – 8th grade NAEP (2003-2011), negative value = closing gap</td>
<td>+2.1</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achieving Excellence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math excellence – Percent advanced on 8th grade NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in math excellence – Percent advanced on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
<td>+2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate – Public schools (class of 2008)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in graduation rate – Public schools (2000-2008)</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>+4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Placement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High AP test scores – Scores of 3 or higher per 100 students (2010)</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in AP Scores – Change in high scores per 100 students (2000-2010)</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE** | **D+** | **32** | **C-**
Nation Receives Passing Grade on Achievement, But Just Barely

The EPE Research Center’s K-12 Achievement Index awards states points based on three distinct aspects of student achievement: current levels of performance (status), improvements over time (change), and achievement gaps between poor and nonpoor students (equity).

The nation as a whole earns 69.7 points, on a 100-point scale, for a grade of C-. The leading state, Massachusetts, earns 85.9 points and a B, while the District of Columbia finishes last with a score of 56.3.

Only two states—Massachusetts and New Jersey—demonstrate consistently high marks across all three elements of the K-12 Achievement Index, earning a grade of B-minus or better in each of the three achievement dimensions.

NOTE: State subscores may not sum to total score due to rounding.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2012
### Policy Indicators

The national summary column indicates the number of states that have enacted a particular policy or, as applicable, the number of states with the specified policy enacted for all subject areas or at all grade spans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2012</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/language arts standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>33 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies/history standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary resources — Materials elaborate on standards in all core subjects (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary resources — Materials provided for particular student populations (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test items used to measure student performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-choice items (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-answer items (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended-response items – English/language arts (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended-response items – Other subjects (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios of student work (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of assessments to academic standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/language arts (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies/history (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertically equated scores on assessments in grades 3-8 in English (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertically equated scores on assessments in grades 3-8 in math (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark assessments or item banks provided to educators (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Accountability</strong> (policies must apply to Title I and non-Title I schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State ratings — State assigns ratings to all schools on criteria other than AYP (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide student ID — State has a statewide student-identification system (2010)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards — State provides rewards to high-performing or improving schools (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance — State provides assistance to low-performing schools (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions — State sanctions low-performing schools (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE** B- (rank= 33) **B**

Key:  E = English, M = Math, S = Science, H = History/social studies
ES = elementary school, MS = middle school, HS = high school
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## THE TEACHING PROFESSION

### Efforts to Improve Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2012</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability for Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for initial licensure (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* indicates requirements that do not also apply to alternative-route candidates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial coursework in subject area(s) taught</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of basic skills</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of subject-specific knowledge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of subject-specific pedagogy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-teaching during teacher training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other clinical experiences during teacher training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraging out-of-field teaching (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct parental notification of out-of-field teachers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban or cap on the number of out-of-field teachers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating teacher performance (2011-12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations of all teachers’ performance required</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement is tied to teacher evaluations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual basis for teacher evaluations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All evaluators of teachers receive formal training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher education programs (2011-12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankings/results published for teacher-preparation institutions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs accountable for graduates’ classroom performance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data systems to monitor quality (2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State links teachers to student-growth data</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State links teachers and their performance data back to teacher education programs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentives and Allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of entry and transfer barriers (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative-route program for teacher preparation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-license reciprocity or portability arrangement with other state(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-pension portability across state lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and incentives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-pay parity – Teacher salaries at least equal to comparable occupations (2010)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts report school-level salaries for teachers (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-for-performance program or pilot rewards teachers for raising student achievement (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated roles for teachers formally recognized by state (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for teachers taking on differentiated roles (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives for teachers to earn national-board certification (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Incentives and Allocation (cont.)

Managing and allocating teaching talent (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives to teachers working in targeted schools</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives to teachers working in hard-to-staff teaching-assignment areas</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives to board-certified teachers working in targeted schools</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives to principals working in targeted schools</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building and Supporting Capacity

Supports for beginning teachers (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction program for all new teachers funded by state</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring program for all new teachers funded by state</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring-program standards for selecting, training, and/or matching mentors</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced workload for all first-year teachers</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Professional development (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal professional-development standards</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional development financed by state for all districts</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts/schools required to set aside time for professional development</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional development aligned with local priorities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### School leadership (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards for licensure of school administrators</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required internship for aspiring principals</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction or mentoring program for aspiring principals</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### School working conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program to reduce or limit class size implemented by state (2011-12)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-to-teacher ratio median in elementary schools is 15:1 or less (2009-10)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State tracks condition of school facilities (2011-12)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State posts school-level teacher-survey data on climate, working conditions (2011-12)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GRADE D (rank= 43) C**
Reaching the Parity Line

An original analysis by the EPE Research Center finds that public school teachers nationwide make 94 cents for every dollar earned by workers in 16 comparable occupations. Thirteen states reach or surpass the pay-parity line, meaning teachers earn at least as much as comparable workers.

Occupations Comparable to K-12 Teachers

- Accountants and auditors
- Architects, except naval
- Archivists, curators, and museum technicians
- Clergy
- Compliance officers, except agriculture, construction, health and safety, and transportation
- Computer programmers
- Conservation scientists and foresters
- Counselors
- Editors, news analysts, reporters, and correspondents
- Human-resources, training, and labor-relations specialists
- Insurance underwriters
- Occupational therapists
- Other teachers and instructors (excludes preschool, K-12, and postsecondary)
- Physical therapists
- Registered nurses
- Technical writers

Equity and Spending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2012</th>
<th>Utah State Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth-Neutrality Score</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLoone Index</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of Variation</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Range</td>
<td>$2,212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spending</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted per-pupil expenditures (PPE)</td>
<td>$7,217</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$11,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students funded at or above national average</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending Index</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending on education</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions of School Finance Indicators**

**Wealth-Neutrality Score:** The wealth-neutrality score shows the degree to which state and local revenue are related to the property wealth of districts. A negative score means that, on average, poorer districts actually have more funding per weighted pupil than wealthy districts do. A positive score means the opposite: Wealthy districts have more funding per weighted pupil than poor districts do.

**McLoone Index:** The McLoone Index is based on the assumption that if all students in the state were lined up according to the amount their districts spent on them, perfect equity would be achieved if every district spent at least as much as that spent on the pupil in the middle of the distribution, or the median. The McLoone Index is the ratio of the total amount spent on pupils below the median to the amount that would be needed to raise all students to the median per-pupil expenditure in the state.

**Coefficient of Variation:** The coefficient of variation is a measure of the disparity in funding across school districts in a state. The value is calculated by dividing the standard deviation of adjusted spending per pupil by the state's average spending per pupil. The standard deviation is a measure of dispersion (i.e., how spread out spending levels are across a state's districts). If all districts in a state spent exactly the same amount per pupil, its coefficient of variation would be zero. As the coefficient gets higher, the variation in the amounts spent across districts also gets higher. As the coefficient gets lower, it indicates greater equity.

**Restricted Range:** This indicator captures the differences in funding levels found between the highest- and lowest-spending districts in a state. The index value is calculated as the difference in per-pupil spending levels at the 95th and 5th percentiles. Districts enrolling fewer than 200 students are excluded from the analysis.

**Spending Index:** The Spending Index takes into account both the proportion of students enrolled in districts with spending at the national average, and the degree to which spending is below that benchmark in districts where per-pupil expenditures fall below the national average. Each district in which the per-pupil-spending figure (adjusted for student needs and cost differences) reaches or exceeds the national average receives a score of 1 multiplied by the number of students in the district. A district whose adjusted spending per pupil is below the national average receives a score equal to its per-pupil spending divided by the national average and then multiplied by the number of pupils in the district. The spending index is the sum of district scores divided by the total number of students in the state. If all districts spend above the U.S. average, the state attains a perfect index score of 100 points.

Note: The District of Columbia and Hawaii are single-district jurisdictions. As a result, it is not possible to calculate measures of financial equity, which capture the distribution of funding across districts within a state. The District of Columbia and Hawaii do not receive grades for school finance and are not included in the rankings reported in this table.
# Education Alignment Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early-Childhood Education (2010-11)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early learning – State early-learning standards aligned with K-12 standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-readiness definition – State formally defines school readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-readiness assessment – Readiness of entering students assessed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-readiness intervention – Programs for students not deemed ready</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten standards – Learning expectations aligned with elementary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postsecondary Education (2010-11)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College readiness – State defines college readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College preparation – College prep required to earn a high school diploma</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course alignment – Credits for high school diploma aligned with postsecondary system</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment alignment – High school assessment aligned with postsecondary system</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary decisions – High school assessment used for postsecondary decisions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy and Workforce (2010-11)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work readiness – State K-12 system defines work readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-tech diploma – State offers high school diploma with career specialization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry certification – K-12 has path for industry-recognized certificate or license</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable credits – K-12 pathway to earn career-tech. credits for postsecondary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## A National Perspective

The EPE Research Center examined state efforts to connect the K-12 education system with early learning, higher education, and the world of work. Fourteen key transitions and alignment policies were included in *Quality Counts 2011*.

By the 2010-11 school year, most states had enacted at least eight of the 14 tracked policies. Thirteen states had 10 or more policies in place. At the other end of the spectrum, Montana and South Dakota had just three such policies in place, and Nebraska only two.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2011
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